DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 451 IR 006 613

AUTHOR Barkman, Donna
TITLE Report on the Study of Cooperative Materials Examination Centers for Wisconsin.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 111p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Programs; *Evaluation; *Instructional Materials; Instructional Materials Centers; Instructional Media; Interviews; *Media Selection; Networks; Questionnaires; Regional Programs; *Statewide Planning; *Surveys

ABSTRACT

This study investigates, identifies, and documents the need for cooperative media review centers in the state of Wisconsin and makes recommendations for their development and implementation. To this end, over 100 persons representing library/media/education and professional organizations were interviewed, literature reviews conducted, resources and materials examined, and a mail survey conducted with questionnaires sent to 400 school media centers and public libraries. Findings of the survey and interviews indicate strong interest and support for improving selection and examination centers with the need for a statewide system, based on a network of examination centers, which would provide materials and programs for evaluating materials. Recommendations include: (1) forming a multitype council in the Madison area to coordinate services and programs; (2) establishing mobile services for the purpose of materials review and evaluation in the far northern part of the state; and (3) establishing one stationary center which would house a wide range of materials and service multitype institutions in a radius of 60 to 80 miles. Also contained in the report are a brief survey of the history and development of examination centers, long range goals of the Wisconsin program, and specific components of examination center development. A bibliography on cooperative materials evaluation centers, a copy of the questionnaire with tabulated responses, and survey procedures are appended. (JPF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161451

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT ON THE STUDY OF

COOPERATIVE MATERIALS EXAMINATION CENTERS

FOR WISCONSIN

June, 1978

by

Donna Barkman
Project Coordinator

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Denise B. Erwin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

University of Wisconsin-Madison
School of Education
John R. Palmer, Dean

Instructional Materials Center
Denise B. Erwin, Director
Project Administrator

Library Services and Construction Act Project III-78-14

IR006613

CONTENTS

Glossary iii

Chapter 1 Concept Background. 1

Chapter 2 Definition of Examination Centers 5

Chapter 3 Study Procedures. 7

Chapter 4 History and Development of Examination Centers (Brief Survey) 8

Chapter 5 Examination Center Rationale. 14

Chapter 6 Wisconsin Rationale 22

Chapter 7 Related Educational Centers 30

Chapter 8 Overview of Examination Center Development. 36

Chapter 9 Specific Components of Examination Center Development. 39

Chapter 10 Recommendations 64

Chapter 11 Conclusions 73

Appendix A - Bibliography 75

- List of Persons Interviewed. 79

Appendix B - Survey Results 83

Appendix C - Procedures 96

GLOSSARY

examination center - a center which collects and provides efficient on-site access to a broad and varied array of non-circulating library/media/education materials and provides a strong and continuous program of education to its clientele in the selection, evaluation and use of these materials. Used herein interchangeably with "selection centers."

teacher center - a center "for, by and of teachers" where they can go to exchange ideas, hold workshops and inservice programs, and continue their education in formal and informal ways.

regional media center - a center operated by an educational service agency (often an intermediate unit) providing school districts with cooperative purchase of materials and circulation of these materials to participating schools, plus a variety of other resource-sharing services.

media - library materials of all kinds, print and nonprint.

intertype council - a voluntary organization as they presently exist in Wisconsin, involving libraries of all kinds.

area multitype council - a statutory organization, as proposed by the Task Force on Interlibrary Cooperation and Resource Sharing, involving libraries of all kinds, with such councils having powers to set policy and distribute funds for networking programs.

ALA - American Library Association.

AASL - American Association of School Librarians (of ALA)

GLOSSARY...

RTSD -	Reference and Technical Services Division (of ALA).
AAP -	American Association of Publishers.
AMP -	Association of Media Producers.
ESEA -	Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
LSCA -	Library Services and Construction Act.
CESA -	Cooperative Educational Service Agency (an intermediate unit between the school district and the State Department of Public Instruction).
CCBC -	Cooperative Children's Book Center, Madison, Wisconsin; a juvenile trade book research and examination facility.

Chapter One

CONCEPT BACKGROUND

In August, 1977, the Division for Library Services awarded Library Services and Construction Act Title III funding to a proposal submitted by Denise B. Erwin, Director of the Instructional Materials Center, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison, for a planning grant to identify and document the need for "Cooperative Media Review Centers" in the State of Wisconsin. This grant provided money for an eight month period to conduct the study and, based on the findings, to submit a report which would include a plan for the development and implementation of such an evaluation program. This proposal was based on work done previously, nationwide in scope and widely reported in the library press.

In 1968, guided by the National Book Committee and funded by the United States Office of Education, a four-phase project was started that was aimed toward the development of Educational Media Selection Centers. The first phase studied the facilities that existed in the nation at that time and is documented by John Rowell, Project Director, and M. Ann Heidbreder, Project Coordinator, in a book published by the American Library Association in 1971 entitled, Educational Media Selection Centers: Identification and Analysis

of Current Practices. Their report describes their survey methods, analyzes and criticizes them and presents the data recovered, making recommendations based on that data.

The second phase, the development of guidelines to establish selection centers, was undertaken by Cora Paul Bomar, with the assistance of M. Ann Heidbreder and Carol A. Nemeyer. This document was published by ALA in 1973 and is now in its third printing. Its contributors include experts from the library and education fields, with each person providing a chapter. This report, Guide to the Development of Educational Media Selection Centers, together with the first-phase report, is the basis for this investigation. It is necessary, therefore, for anyone examining the concept to become familiar with the ideas and data presented in the two texts named above.

(Unfortunately, Phase III, development of model examination centers, and Phase IV, evaluation of those centers and the guidelines in relationship to them, were not funded, probably due to the demise of the National Book Committee.)

At the outset of the Wisconsin study, two criticisms of the books were encountered, each expressed by one person only, but both important enough to be considered seriously and dealt with. The first criticism was based on a rumor that the Rowell investigation was not carefully done and, thus, false in its conclusions. The text itself gives no indication of this; each step appears to be thorough and, in fact, cautious in its methods and applications. Just as important, the methodology included an on-going evaluation by its planners and

team members, so that, while mistakes were no doubt made, they were acknowledged, analyzed and compensated for, before conclusions were reached. Moreover, several centers in Wisconsin were part of the Rowell survey process, and at no time during the course of the Wisconsin study, did anyone from these centers indicate dissatisfaction with the Rowell work.

The second criticism is that the concept of selection centers is dated and outgrown; therefore, it is claimed that both the Rowell and Bomar books are not valid as current resource material. In answer to this, several points must be made: the Bomar Guide was well-reviewed and accepted from all professional vantage points when it was published five years ago; it continues to be cited and quoted in almost every publication and speech that deals with this topic and is praised for its foresight and vision. More than several persons involved in the original studies expressed the opinion that the Guide was, in fact, ahead of its time and that the ideas on which it is based are only now becoming popular, politically, economically and philosophically.

This feeling is validated by the fact that at the 1977 ALA Detroit Conference Program where the study on marketing and selection of educational materials done by AASL/RTSD/AAP was discussed, "it was urged that renewed efforts be made in the various states and at the federal level to establish model examination centers and to restudy the examination center concept" (Nemeyer & Paul, 1978, p. 175).

These texts, then, represent the data and philosophy on which the Wisconsin study was predicated; they are included with the

submission of this report so that they may be used both as a foundation for it and concommitant to it.

Chapter Two

DEFINITION OF EXAMINATION CENTERS

Solving the problem of defining "Educational Media Selection Centers" as they are called in the national study, or "Cooperative Media Review Centers" as they are called in the grant proposal for the Wisconsin study, can become more of a semantic than an intellectual process. Indeed, other states variously use "Review and Evaluation Centers," "Examination Collections" and "Preview and Evaluation Services." During the course of this study, all of these terms, and more, were used. Gradually "educational" and "media" were excluded, since they were perceived as limited or confusing in the context of the Wisconsin intertype concept. "Cooperative Materials Examination Centers" was finally chosen as the best, but still less than perfect, descriptor. For the purposes of this report and without going into all the nuances of other usages, the centers shall be referred to simply and interchangeably as "examination" or "selection" centers.

The working definition: An examination center collects and provides efficient on-site access to a broad and varied array of non-circulating library/media/education materials and provides a strong and continuous program of education to its clientele in the selection,

evaluation and use of these materials.

This basic definition will be broken down, augmented and refined as the report continues, but without ever invalidating the two fundamental functions: materials collection and continuing education programs. Further, examination centers are related to, but do not encompass in concept, although they might in practice, other service facilities identified as regional media centers and teacher centers.

Chapter Three

STUDY PROCEDURES

Two broad areas of investigation constituted the basis of and focus for this study; first, the concept of examination centers -- theory, purpose, history, examples, components, mechanics; second -- the status of materials evaluation in Wisconsin including existing resources, patterns, needs and trends. The goal, then, of the study is to integrate the data from these two areas into cogent and relevant recommendations.

The procedures used were several (and are outlined in detail in Appendix C). Over 100 persons representing library/media/education institutions and professional organizations in Wisconsin and out-of-state were interviewed; resources and materials collections were examined, again in-state and out; pertinent professional conferences and meetings were attended; a mail survey was conducted with questionnaires sent to 400 school media centers and public libraries; and appropriate literature of all kinds was searched and read. Finally, overview and feedback were provided by a twelve-member Advisory Committee, comprised of persons who represented a diversity of library and education interests.

Chapter Four

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF EXAMINATION CENTERS (Brief Survey)

Wisconsin -- the major examination facility, the Cooperative Children's Book Center, opened in 1963 (housed first in the Capitol Building and now on the campus of the University of Wisconsin-Madison); funded cooperatively by the University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Education, the University of Wisconsin-Madison Library School and the Department of Public Instruction, Division for Library Services. It contains a unique juxtaposition of three children's trade book collections: the historical collection, a basic collection and a collection of titles published within the last 18-month period. It responds to current user needs with an active program of workshops and inservice activities for practitioners (librarians/media specialists/educators), weekly programs for University students and faculty, displays on-site for evaluation and research, outreach programs of workshops, presentations and displays at professional conferences and meetings, reference and consultant service based on a professional collection, a comprehensive review file and experienced staff. In addition to many professional and student groups, it serves a large number of individual users from the expected library/

education facilities, plus writers, artists, publishers, researchers, bookstore personnel, parents, et al. Staffed by one full-time professional and two part-time graduate project assistants plus student workers, it is open five days a week plus four evenings and Saturdays.

In addition, the State has several school districts with examination collections: Madison, Milwaukee and Racine (which has a large, centralized, circulating collection which can be, and is, used for some examination). As in other states, there exist additional collections which are circulating, but are used for evaluation purposes mostly by the clientele of the given institution; these include large public library collections, University Instructional Materials Centers, and Special Education Instructional Materials Centers, usually sponsored by the Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs).

Pennsylvania -- Other states have also seen the need for helping the library and education establishments choose and use materials more confidently, wisely and efficiently. At about the same time that John Rowell was conducting the selection center study, he was also leading Pennsylvania toward establishing a network of such centers in that State. He was assisted and then replaced in this role by Elizabeth Hoffman who built that system of centers; they are now headed by Joan Diana, Chief, Division of School Library/Media Services. As the only statewide network of examination centers, they are operated by the Bureau of Instructional Support Services on a shared-cost basis with five Intermediate Units (comparable to Wisconsin's CESAs) throughout the Commonwealth. Six were originally planned, but only five were funded; the Center in Philadelphia presently is not as

strong as the others (due, in part, to two relocations in several years). The remaining four are secure, contrary to most casual information sources.

The status of examination centers is well-hidden, generally. ERIC and Library Literature searches produce very little data about them; intelligence must be gathered from human resources, one piece at a time. It ultimately reveals that there are, indeed, a number of active and growing selection centers and services. Because of the difficulty in identifying these centers, the following synopses in no way represent an exhaustive list. There are no doubt others, particularly juvenile book collections in State Libraries and other multimedia selection centers at local, district and system levels. However, these are more than likely to be representative of the active, strong statewide or regional efforts.

Washington, D.C. -- EDMARC, a national Educational Materials Review Center, it includes text and juvenile trade books, and some other instructional materials; founded as a resource for other nations, but now focuses on the information needs of the United States with its comprehensive and continuous display in the lobby of a United States Office of Education building; it frequently publishes book-lists and annotated bibliographies.

Maryland -- a recent entry into the selection center field with a facility located in Anne Arundel County, this is a cooperative venture between the State Department of Education and the County's

school district. It is, however, mandated to serve the entire State, while two other county centers (Montgomery and Prince George's) accommodate just their own constituents. Encompassing instructional media of all kinds, the Center is staffed by one professional and three support persons; evaluations are done by the staff, in conjunction with State consultants, and by users of the Center. Information on collection holdings is computerized. Department personnel project that two more Centers are needed in order to offer complete and accessible service to all State residents.

North Carolina -- sponsored by the State Department of Public Instruction and supported in part with ESEA IV-C funds, the Center is part of an overall program called "Materials Review and Evaluation Services" which emanates from the Center and which conducts a systematic review program, producing many Advisory Lists of Instructional Media; coordinates the use of the mediamobile which serves the outer reaches of the State; provides consultant services; and contributes a steady program of workshops, inservice and continuing education activities. It is estimated that three more are needed in order to provide adequate service throughout the State.

Indiana -- opened in 1976, this "Materials Preview and Evaluation Center" is a cooperative venture between the Department of Public Instruction, Division of Instructional Media and the Indianapolis School District. It serves the entire State, with instructional media of all kinds, including an emphasis on adult education materials. It is housed in an old Coca-Cola office building in downtown Indianapolis and has a strong program of inservice programs, workshops

and drop-in consultant help.

Virginia -- a well-established examination center, it is State-funded now, although it was started on Title II monies. It offers for examination print, nonprint and textbooks and includes, like most of the other centers, a professional collection and conference rooms. The Center produces materials for use by other State agencies; it is staffed by two professionals and three support persons. For complete coverage and service, the State hopes to establish several more.

Kalamazoo, Michigan -- sponsored for and by the Kalamazoo Public Schools, an annotated list of current holdings of instructional materials at the Center is sent out every two weeks, at which time each media specialist gets released time to review the materials. The lists are compiled twice a year for back-ordering purposes. The Center also offers workshops and inservice programs.

Nebraska -- an examination center sponsored by the State Department of Education and housed in a mediamobile, it takes instructional materials, programs and services directly to school districts which request them. Not a formally established facility, it is dependent upon the dedication and commitment of the staff; during those years when mobile services are provided, they are enthusiastically received.

Illinois -- starting with 15 children's trade book centers in 1970, this state is now operating seven, with the prediction that it will be down to five strong, active centers in a few years. They are funded by public library systems, but the level of service has

varied considerably, accounting for the failure rate. They are used by both school and public libraries; some are situated in large public libraries, one is in a university setting, one at a community college. Prognosis for a smaller number of successful centers is excellent.

Oklahoma -- basically a juvenile trade book collection, which is expanding to include toys, games and realia. Sponsored by the State Library, this center provides a growing program of workshops, in-service programs, selection meetings and a laboratory for literature classes. Additionally, it maintains a review file and is adjacent to the State professional collection.

Missouri -- also a State Library children's trade book examination collection, this center provides traveling exhibits, consultant help, bibliographies produced by a review committee and acts as a liaison to local public library activities.

Broward County, Florida -- funded by the State Department of Education and local school districts, this center has suffered from poor financial support; the Director is enthusiastic about its services, although limited, and adamant about its educational necessity.

These examination support services of other states provide a backdrop against which Wisconsin can compare its own policies and programs and determine in what direction and at what speed it wants to go.

Chapter Five

EXAMINATION CENTER RATIONALE

General Evidence

There is a compelling and comprehensive need, on the part of all who purchase and use materials, for help in the processes of evaluating for quality and utilization and for selecting economically and appropriately. This need for hands-on experience is an expressed one, documented in studies, surveys and interviews, including those done for this report. The need is also expressed in the continued immense popularity of publishers' and vendors' exhibits, whether by Baker & Taylor, Demco, Books on Exhibit or the massive displays at conferences and conventions of librarians, AV specialists, teachers or day care officials.

The need is also an inescapably deduced one, based on many factors operative in the library/education worlds. Identifying and analyzing these factors is an important step in establishing justification for building one center or a network.

Materials are burgeoning -- in kind, number, application, and complexity. The individual librarian, media specialist or teacher cannot possibly keep up with publication and production, no matter

how narrow the field, without support of some kind.

The economic pressures of tighter budgets (often not even keeping up with inflationary trends) and stricter fiscal accountability are demanding that each dollar be spent conscientiously. The rising costs of materials and the comparatively higher cost of nonprint media mean that even a small error in judgment can be an expensive one.

Another factor contributing to need, usually based also on economic exigencies, is the continuing, and sometimes increased, use of paraprofessionals and volunteers without education in methods of evaluation. These individuals are staffing libraries and media centers and are given responsibility for recommending and even selecting materials.

Societal changes must also be considered. There is increased awareness of social issues not only on the part of library/education professionals but also on the part of the lay person. There are growing demands by the user of materials, and the taxpayer, that these materials reflect our society in every aspect and keep up-to-the-minute about every subject; as information grows, the requirements grow to provide it accurately and immediately. The public is no longer a passive consumer: a 1976 Educational Research Service Report states that challenges to instructional materials in selected school districts rose from seven in the two combined years of 1971-72 and 1973-74 to 103 in the single year of 1975-76. This trend is reflected in all kinds of libraries, not just the school media center.

Studies done for this report and on a nationwide scale by

AAP/ALA in 1974 (academic and public libraries) and in 1977 (school media centers) reveal that reviews are the most common tool used in the selection of materials. While there is nothing inherently wrong with this method, the facts indicate "that only approximately 10 per cent of the books published in this country ever get reviewed" (Nemeyer & Paul, 1978, p. 174) which means, of course, that 90% of all books must be identified and chosen by other methods. A 1972 study by Rosemary Weber at Drexel University showed that of 1,145 children's books reviewed by five periodicals in a four-month period, School Library Journal covered only 693, more than twice the number of the next-highest coverage, and that only five of the entire lot were reviewed by all five of the major children's review publications (Henne, 1976, p. 21). Children's book reviewing is also criticized for its considerable time lag (an impractical lapse of time between book publication and book review access) and for the superficiality and brevity of its reviews.

Nonprint materials are even more bereft of review coverage. The majority of these materials, especially those designed for classroom use, are not reviewed at all. Those reviews which do exist are scattered throughout a variety of journals and are difficult to retrieve. In addition, since evaluation of these media is a newer critical form, the quality of many published evaluations is considered less skilled than it should be for excellent selection help. While personal knowledge of materials is ranked important by library media specialists and by the producers/publishers as well (again in the AAP/ALA studies), evaluation is usually done by

individual preview, a less than satisfactory method.

Of course, specialized lists and bibliographies abound, often locally produced and often excellent, but finding them when needed (since there is no distribution system or clearinghouse), constitutes a major barrier to their effective use. These bibliographies often represent a considerable duplication of effort, even when the process is considered as important as the product.

Public Library Needs

Service goals of public libraries have been evolving in recent years: trends indicate that they are focusing on serving the educational and informational needs of various unserved publics, among them the retired and elderly population, the pre-school population and the adult and young adult population which seeks alternative educational resources. The demands for materials by the retired and older citizen will enlarge dramatically as the number of persons in that age group increases in the next 25 years; day care programs are increasing rapidly and moving away from simple custodial care and toward meeting educational needs of the young child. And finally, continuing education is becoming a concept important to adults in all kinds and levels of employment; it is no longer confined to attending graduate school or upgrading professional skills through university extension programs. The public library plans to meet its share of these alternative and continuing education needs. Moreover, it is moving gradually, but consistently, toward the

provision of more nonprint materials and the hardware needed to utilize them.

These changing influences all underline the increasing necessity on the part of public librarians to continually sharpen and broaden their evaluation skills and to widen their knowledge of the expanding materials market from which they can choose.

School Needs

Like public librarians, school personnel also have increasing need to examine materials. While school media specialists state that they need and want examination opportunity, the recent AASL/RTSD/AAP survey reveals that 54% of the school media specialists responding cite difficulty in previewing materials; 63% have no access to print examination; 76% have no access to nonprint examination. Their pressures are intensified by various developments in the school media world. To begin, according to the Educational Products Information Exchange, instructional materials structure 95% of classroom time and 90% of homework time (EPIE Report, 1977, pp. 5-6).

Another demand comes from the many and varied changes of curriculum emphasis which require constant reassessment and purchase of materials to support the reordered philosophy. At the present time, the curricular needs include Back to Basics teaching, Open Classroom teaching, the Individualized Education Program implementing P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act), Individually Guided Education, suggestions to replace expensive

laboratory equipment with the creative use of nonprint materials and the pressure to integrate, not just use, more media in the curriculum.

Changes are shown, as well, in a study conducted during the 1976-77 school year on trends in education and materials. This research, commissioned by the National Textbook Company, sought analysis of the last five years' trends, and projection of trends in the next five years. The subject areas covered were language arts, mathematics and modern foreign languages. "One trend regarding textbooks was reported in all three subject areas: the decline of the use of a single comprehensive textbook in the classroom..."; a parallel trend, "the increase in the use of many different kinds of instructional materials" (EPIEgram, 2/1/78, p. 3).

Indicating even more change and pressure is the statement of Alexander Burke, president of McGraw-Hill Book Company: "In the past 10 years, electivism and special-interest groups have drained teaching resources from basic skills subjects. Pressures for minimum competency will bring an agonizing reappraisal of all courses and allocation of resources. For publishers, this will mean a rare opportunity to create a new generation of materials" (Doebler, 1978, p. 39). Unfortunately, most media specialists have minimal preparation in the evaluation of the classroom materials and their uses.

While the media specialist welcomes the new wave of inclusion in the educational team, this means that s/he must know the curriculum well and purchase appropriately and must very often assume the leadership role in regard to materials selection. "More than one

half of classroom teachers (51 per cent) have received no training in the use of the materials they are using on a day-to-day basis" (EPIEgram, 12/1/76, p. 1). Publishers are hoping to come to the rescue in this regard. McGraw-Hill's Burke says, "Publishers as teacher trainers: In the 1960's, publishers learned that the effectiveness of instructional materials varies directly with the training a teacher receives in their use. The combination of younger teachers, higher turnover and more complex instruction systems will require in-school retraining of teachers" (Doebler, 1978, p. 39). As only one example, Open Court Publishing Company has already established a strong inservice program, involving, in 1977, 700 classroom teachers. Despite their lack of training, teachers are so concerned about the media which they use in the classroom that, according to a 1977 National Education Association poll, they spend $30 million annually out-of-pocket on instructional materials. However, they are often misled by lists of out-of-date supplementary materials in textbooks plus publishers' blurbs and catalogs. They, along with the media specialists, are vulnerable to "publishers as teacher trainers."

Higher Education Programs

All of the foregoing statements have direct implications for the institutions which educate teachers, librarians and media specialists. Their preservice training must include broader and richer course work vis à vis materials evaluation, selection and use. In order to keep up with the rapid changes in materials and issues and then

keep such changes in perspective, inservice and continuing education institutions must make available every opportunity for updating and deepening evaluation abilities for all persons involved in the purchase of materials, whether for libraries, media centers, classrooms or community education endeavors. Selection centers with a broad range of materials for examination, comparison, criticism and discussion would provide library science and education departments with the laboratory they need for teaching, exploration and research.

Chapter Six

WISCONSIN RATIONALE

Long-Range Program

School/Public Cooperation

While the above discussion of justification was totally appropriate to this State, Wisconsin has additional and compelling reasons for interest in examination centers. Looking at the "Comprehensive Long-Range Program for Library Services," prepared by the Division for Library Services in 1977 and published in the Wisconsin Library Bulletin in September-October, 1977, it becomes clear that the concept of examination centers is one which would help implement a number of plans, goals and objectives, particularly because this study was predicated on the principle of intertype cooperation, but also because it is a concept pertinent to other areas of library planning as well.

In terms of serving children and young adults, the Division for Library Services encourages communication and cooperation between school and public libraries; when this is done, "they thrive together, developing reciprocal momentum which benefits a given community far beyond dollar investment" (Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 9-10,

1977, p. 201). A regional examination center is a natural and ideal focus for these kinds of programs, as the many recent activities at the Cooperative Children's Book Center have already demonstrated. While such programs can exist and progress without a center (as witness the excellent cooperative services in the Southwestern portion of the State, the many shared activities in the Southeast and the LSCA-funded program, sponsored by the South Central System and the Madison Area Library Council to assist just such cooperation), nevertheless, a center can provide and support many more kinds of cooperative opportunities which are not available without the materials collection and the programs which are an expected concommitant.

Day Care Community

The Wisconsin Long-Range Program also recognizes the obligation of public libraries to serve the pre-school community (Bulletin, as above, p. 201). The number of licensed day care centers in the State has increased each of the past ten years, from 257 centers in 1967 to 893 in 1977; the number of children served by them has grown from 7,359 in 1967 to 30,465 in 1977. There are, of course, many children in day care situations which go unreported to the State. While the equipment in these centers is often of an acceptable quality, the learning materials usually range from non-existent to fair. Since it is lay persons who frequently staff the centers, theirs is a pressing need for professional guidance in selecting and using learning materials.

Sponsored by the Milwaukee day care service district, there

is already one successful "Resource Room" for day care centers in Milwaukee, but this single collection can hardly meet the growing awareness of, and demand for, selection help in serving this age group. Selection centers with an array of media to choose from can help to meet this need by serving the centers themselves and, additionally, the public libraries which serve the centers.

Adult Education

Another substantial trend toward "broadening the concepts of the public library as a community adult education and cultural center" (Bulletin, as above, p. 203) requires many new and especially-selected materials to serve as a foundation for this shift in commitment and emphasis. Even more to the point, "collections of library materials suffer from serious inadequacies in most public libraries in Wisconsin, not only with respect to size but in nature and quality as well.... The availability of audiovisual materials, of paperback collections, of specialized information services is below the needed levels" (Bulletin, as above, p. 205). There is no doubt that selection centers can be immeasurably useful in overcoming these inadequacies by providing the materials from which to choose and the programs to help librarians make these choices.

Special Education

Services to the handicapped and special education children focus strongly and necessarily on materials. These materials are collected, developed and circulated from 15 regional Special Education

Learning Resource Centers. As special education children are "mainstreamed" into the classroom, as required by P.L. 94-142, teachers untrained in special materials selection will be required to develop Individual Educational Plans. By law, these plans demand the specification of the exact program, and exact materials to be used, with each handicapped child. Examination centers can provide continuing education services, with the cooperation of special education teachers and other experts; they can provide a special materials collection at which the Learning Resource Centers staff can examine and select materials; and, because of their library orientation, they can provide help with mediagraphic control in the Learning Resource Centers.

Public Library Goals

Another section of the Long-Range Program deals with plans for public libraries. The Bureau of Public and Cooperative Library Services has as its second goal "(t)o establish and start to implement a comprehensive program of continuing education for librarians" (Bulletin, as above, p. 223). Selection centers with broad, dynamic and continuous education programs relevant to the many issues of selection and evaluation would automatically and substantially underwrite this goal.

• The relationship of BCPACLS's Goal Number 3 to the establishment and operation of cooperative selection centers is as important as it is obvious: "To assure most effective use of the resources of all Wisconsin libraries and information services through cooperative arrangements" (Bulletin, as above, p. 223). Examination centers

offer many means of assistance in using resources effectively and cooperatively.

School Library Media Objectives

The final points based on the Long-Range Comprehensive Program speak to statements from the Bureau of School Library Media Programs. "Objective 4: To expand the use of the Standard 121.02 (j) of the Wisconsin Statutes" (Bulletin, as above, p. 226). This standard says that each school district "shall provide adequate instructional materials, texts and library services which reflect the cultural diversity and pluralistic nature of American society." Both in providing materials from which to select and in developing programs to improve evaluation abilities, examination centers can be a resource central to achieving this objective.

Further, Objective 12 reads, "To provide information relating to the role of schools in networking; to encourage schools to initiate and participate in networking activities" (Bulletin, as above, p. 228). Here again is an obvious correlation between the services which examination centers can provide and the achievement of library/media goals. The intertype centers would be, of course, a fundamental networking activity in and of themselves; in addition, they can provide programs and support for other kinds of networking involvement. The American Association of School Librarians networking committee (chaired by Richard Sorenson, a Wisconsin School Library Media Program consultant) states in its 1977 report that one of the strengths and potential contributions which school media centers can make to

other kinds of libraries in a networking arrangement is an examination center for children's and young adult materials (Wisconsin Library Bulletin, 11-12, 1977, p. 260). Selection centers can provide support and implementation for a number of the State's expressed long-range programs, goals and objectives.

Evidence of Interest

Meanwhile, certain concrete activities and developments that have taken place during the last few years also indicate evidence of need for, and interest in, examination opportunities:

Two years ago, the Bureau of Public and Cooperative Library Services Children's and Young Adult consultant instituted a review network of juvenile trade books. Participated in by both school and public librarians, the program was enthusiastically received by many in the field and will continue to operate but, because of funding cutbacks, on a more limited schedule.

In a two-month period following publicity about EDMARC in library and education journals, two letters were received from Wisconsin educators by the Washington, D.C., examination center. Requesting selection help in both cases, they sought information from out-of-state. One letter, dated November 17, 1977, from a junior high school media specialist in Black River Falls asks: "If it is not possible for individual schools to receive this kind of service (evaluation print-outs), would it be possible to use area or regional depositories?"

That help is needed with materials selection is further

indicated by J. Joseph Daly, Director of the Minnesota Instructional Materials Center, a statewide circulating media center. He estimates that the number of materials evaluation requests which originate in Western Wisconsin constitute approximately 15% of that center's total service.

Another recent program filling a gap is that of the Children's Department of Brown County Library, headquarters for the Nicolet Federated Library System. It is establishing a periodic review and evaluation service (setting aside space, materials and time) in order to meet the hands-on needs of the smaller school and public libraries in the area.

The planned topic of the Fall, 1978, Southeastern Children's Librarians' meeting is "Toys, Games and Realia." This topic was chosen because of a growing interest in providing non-book materials in public library children's rooms and because of an expressed difficulty in identifying and selecting these kinds of media.

Each of these examples furnishes substance to the claim that Wisconsin librarians, teachers and media specialists all have expressed and inferred information needs about materials and their review and evaluation which are not being met by 1) pre-service programs (which can supply only a foundation for further work, in any case); 2) inservice programs (although continuing education for librarians is sponsored by 110 organizations, coordination and focus is needed, while continuing education for teachers on media selection is virtually non-existent); or by 3) any comprehensive, permanent regional facilities to which all have reasonable access. However,

WISCONSIN RATIONALE...

Wisconsin is developing a strong commitment to cooperative activities and resource sharing, which a system of examination centers can both demand and support.

Chapter Seven

RELATED EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

There are two other educational service developments gaining considerable support and attention nationwide and in Wisconsin which are related to examination centers in broad purpose and goals, whose programs also emanate from "centers" and might overlap those of some examination centers, but which are, in focus, fact and philosophy, different from the usual examination facility. These need to be discussed in order to distinguish them from the examination center concept, with which they are frequently confused, and to determine in what ways they might logically and profitably be coordinated or combined.

Regional Media Centers

"Nationally, the movement toward some form of regional service agency is one of the primary organizational thrusts in K-12 education today" (Thompson, 1975 speech). Also known as "Regional Educational Media Centers" and as "Regional Resource Centers" and other local variations, these service agencies exist in many states. Iowa has 16, Michigan has 22 and Minnesota has one extensive center which

serves the whole State. Based on a resource-sharing concept, they purchase materials to enrich and supplement school collections, often emphasizing specialized subject areas or users, audiovisual media and high cost/low use items. Their focus is on purchase, circulation and delivery systems; other common services include hardware and parts purchase, repair and maintenance, and production services, such as laminating, dry mounting, lettering, tape duplication, photography and graphics. Some have professional libraries and some provide inservice programs. A few have computer capabilities which are used variously for centralized cataloging, data processing and materials searches.

Generally, their philosophy of service does not include the concept of review and evaluation as it is being discussed in this study. Those non-circulating examination collections which exist in the Iowa Regional Media Centers are commonly known as "dead collections," because they have no programs to accompany them and the collections are not used. Many proponents of regional media service agencies believe that only the teacher in the classroom setting can assess materials; thus, they "place emphasis on direct service to the teacher, bypassing the media person" (Dresang, 1978, p. 3).

Their history has not notably included intertype cooperation, since their services are classroom and teacher oriented. Nevertheless, the services they provide are extremely useful and their resource-sharing basis is important in policy, principle and economic reality.

There is strong interest in developing regional media service agencies in the State of Wisconsin; their establishment deserves wide

support. However, their fundamental differences in philosophy and focus preclude easy or assumed consolidation with the examination center concept. The fate of the Iowan "dead collections" is a pragmatic prophecy not to be ignored. That is not to imply, however, that examination centers and media service agencies have nothing in common. Their co-existence would presume and demand cooperation, coordination and the same resource-sharing that both concepts are founded on. Gear-like, they could work together, each using, supporting and strengthening the programs and services of the other.

Teacher Centers

The concept of teacher centers is another relatively new educational development. Although there were some single, early examples in the United States, they have basically been imported and adapted from established programs in Britain and Japan, particularly. They have received immense publicity in the last year because of P.L. 94-482 which is granting $8,250,000 this year, and an estimated $10,000,000 next year for the planning, establishment or operation of these centers. The new law has also caused a stir in that it stipulates (par. 197.4) that the Teacher Center Policy Board (required for each funded center) be composed of at least 51% practicing classroom teachers. While this may seem just and logical, it is a unique specification in federal legislation.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education feels that the law gives too much power to the teachers, even though the

grass roots movement itself has been based on teacher control and peer teaching. Dr. Allen A. Schmieder, the program director, believes that a center is "for, by and of teachers ... a place where teachers could go away from administrators, and all kinds of interference..." (Federal Aid Report, November, 1977, p. 2). This report, backed up by other statements in education literature, says that if the Office of Education program is disquieting to anybody, it will be the graduate education schools and the nation's school boards. There is no doubt that the concept is seen as a means of educational reform (Individualized Learning Letter, February, 1978), and, as such, is part of a power struggle, perhaps for certification control (Kaplan, 1978).

At this point, the teacher center concept has no universal clear-cut goals, strategies, participants, leaders, philosophy or governance and is, therefore, vulnerable to challenge. The New York Times reported that "fierce power struggles are underway among school boards, unions and university schools of education for control of the movement" (Fiske, 1977).

This conflict is not apparent in Wisconsin; however, the movement is comparatively new here, with only three functioning teacher centers in the State: Madison Metropolitan School District has an exchange, which encompasses a professional collection, a curriculum examination collection, a strong continuing education program (initiated and taught mostly by teachers) and a workshop for production and construction of classroom materials. In Burlington, Wisconsin, there is a privately sponsored and successful center called The Teacher Place, run by an ex-teacher and very responsive to teachers'

needs. Green Bay is in the process of developing a center, which is a cooperative venture between the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay and Green Bay Public Schools. Other centers may soon be established: the University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse is planning one; West Bend Public Schools has a small teachers' production center. There were approximately thirty applications for federal funds from this State with estimates that three or four will receive grants this year.

The possible relationship between teacher centers and examination centers is not clear cut. While their programs of inservice and continuing education seem to have natural overlap (perhaps to the point of redundancy if kept separate), again their philosophy and focus appear to be considerably different. Selection centers are based on "the collection and evaluation of a comprehensive range of educational media, and the continuous education, primarily inservice, of its clientele in the effective selection and use of media" (Bomar, 1973, p. 88). While these two functions can be of enormous value to teachers at all levels, as discussed earlier, teacher centers on their own have not shown any remarkable interest in materials. "Quite literally, the goal is teacher-made rather than teacher proof curricular materials" (Harris, 1977, p. 27). While the Madison Exchange includes a curricular materials collection (in itself an unusual feature for a teacher center), during one semester studied of the last school year (1977-78) there were only 2 out of 86 inservice workshops or discussions scheduled which were based on materials selection, evaluation or use (Professional Growth Opportunities, 1977-78). Whether one does or does not agree with, or

approve of, this apparent lack of interest on the part of teachers, displayed at least in the teacher center setting, the facts do help to define the relationship. This does not mean that materials examination centers can not serve teachers in many ways; it does mean that they might be more successful in serving them as a totally separate service unit.

Both Pennsylvania and Virginia are considering combining their examination centers with teacher centers yet to be established. The selection centers in these states, however, serve only the school district users, not the public libraries or university programs. If examination centers are to be instituted on an intertype basis, as this study was funded to investigate, focusing on teacher development might upset the very important and possibly precarious balance among the components of schools (media specialist and teacher), public libraries and the university library/media/education programs.

If, in a given and specific situation, there appears to be no community or professional conflict about the teacher center concept, if the teachers show an expressed interest in combining forces and cooperating with the purposes and functions of an examination center and if the other intertype components are fully cognizant of the teacher center mix, in its funding, administrative, staffing and programmatic arrangements, then, and only then, should the combined centers be instituted.

Chapter Eight

AN OVERVIEW OF EXAMINATION CENTER DEVELOPMENT

Before consideration of specific aspects and possibilities of examination center development, it is appropriate to summarize the general response to the concept as evidenced through interviews and discussions throughout the State. Interest, support and enthusiasm characterized the majority reaction. In those minority cases where a negative over-all opinion was expressed, it was usually based on the futility of "trying," rather than on disagreement with the idea itself. Some few persons were opposed to a selection center because it is "not needed," "would not be used" or "is not useful to my institution." Those who had positive opinions often expressed offers of support and promises of cooperation.

Some observations and admonitions made by interviewees were repeated often enough so that they indicated strong patterns of emphasis. They should form a certain bedrock upon which all other selection center considerations might be placed. They are offered here in extracted form:

Selection centers should have

-- a basis in intertype cooperation and resource-sharing

-- multi-type councils as administering agencies,

to assure political balance

-- coordination of centers with each other and with other library/education facilities

-- a clearinghouse function, improving communications among institutions

-- flexibility of planning, based on local needs and input

-- knowledgeable and dynamic staff/leadership

-- relevant and vital programs

-- mobile services to reach chronically unserved library and education institutions

-- permanence of funding.

Selection centers should be concerned about

-- feasibility of securing funding

-- limitations of use due to time and distance restrictions

-- avoiding the destruction of, or competition with, functioning collections and services

-- avoiding duplication of collections or services

-- avoiding construction of more bureaucratic "layers."

In addition to these fundamental expressions, two other generalized impressions of service and attitudes in Wisconsin are here summarized:

1) There is a noticeable amount of fragmentation and distance between each and every aspect of library/media service. Probably due to years of specialization without cooperative activities, this separation of persons by institution, by job, by title, by department,

even when working with the same clientele for the same ends, underscores the need for programs which will bring together the many disparate elements of the library/media/education institutions; public with school librarians, media specialists with classroom teachers, IMC directors with AV specialists, high school with college librarians, continuing education educators with pre-service educators, faculty from higher education programs with persons in the field, and administrators with persons working at all levels.

2) There is, from every portion of the State, considerable resentment of Madison as the seat of "power" in seemingly all matters, certainly not excluding library matters. In addition, there is further resentment in the Northern areas directed toward those cities which legislators and other policymakers refer to as "Northern." Close to one-third of the entire geographic area of the State lies above the "Northern" cities of Eau Claire, Wausau, and Green Bay. Emphasis on local input is essential when plans are made for selection centers or any other library development.

Chapter Nine

SPECIFIC COMPONENTS OF EXAMINATION CENTER DEVELOPMENT

Administrative Structure

There seem to be as many strategies for structuring examination centers as there are extant centers. Wisconsin has an opportunity to develop still another structure, one that would be unique, and one that could also function as a model for other states. This opportunity exists because of recent planning on a statewide basis for intertype cooperation, with recommendations for the development of Area Multitype Councils, similar to the present intertype library councils, but grounded in statute and given certain funds, powers and responsibilities. These councils would be linked by a Professional Advisory Committee and a Staff Director, attached administratively to the Division for Library Services, but would have "autonomous powers to set policy and priorities for library networking programs, and to authorize distribution of available funds for state or area-level networking programs" (Eberhart, 1978). At the top of the pyramid would be a Council on Library Development and Networking with lay members appointed by the Governor.

This plan is explained in detail in Interlibrary Cooperation:

A Wisconsin Plan, the report of the Task Force on Interlibrary Cooperation and Resource Sharing. The Task Force was comprised of 45 persons representing all types of libraries and information services in the State; they worked together for almost a year, developing this networking plan. It was completed June 30, 1976. In April, 1978, affirmation of the plan was expressed by many library representatives at a meeting of the Special Committee on Library Laws, a committee composed of legislators, librarians and lay people, which will report to the legislature by the end of 1978 and make recommendations concerning a number of library issues, among them the statutory recognition of networking councils.

According to Bomar, networks of any kind "pose an additional statutory and administrative challenge, which should be confronted squarely at the planning stage; ... (t)he governance of a center will be determined by the nature of the supportive agencies to be served and by the applicable local, state, and federal legislative provisions" (Bomar, 1973, p. 20). Area Multitype Councils are the obvious and natural organizational structure to carry the responsibility for the development of examination centers. They would be representative of all of the library/education interests in a region, guaranteeing that no single cooperating component would control, or appear to control, a center; they would have a superstructure (the Professional Advisory Committee, the Director and the Council) which would ensure coordination of the centers with each other as they develop and with existing agencies such as the CCBC and other centers. This system would allow for local contribution and

representation and also for long-range statewide planning and goal-setting.

Once the legal provisions are determined, the Area Multitype Councils would be responsible for setting up the administrative system. Each center would need to have its own Board of Directors which would represent the agencies sponsoring the center and would be responsible for policy, long- and short-range goals, creative planning on the individual center basis, and personnel appointments and fiscal arrangements. The Area Multitype Council would also appoint an Advisory Committee, which would represent the needs and interests of the clientele and "would participate in recommending long-range objectives and in evaluating achievement of these objectives" (Bomar, 1973, p. 24).

A Director would be appointed by the Area Multitype Council, in conjunction with the examination center Board of Directors. The Director would be responsible for administering the center on a day-to-day basis and developing programs based on the goals and objectives and continually evaluating the needs of the sponsors and the clientele.

These three elements (Board, Committee and Director) would form the basic management structure. Together, they would be responsible for measuring and assessing the value of each center, in order to judge its effectiveness and determine its further goals and programs. Beyond this, "(t)he identification of the best administrative pattern for a center will be dependent upon the imagination and resourcefulness of the planners, with full consideration of statutory limitations or potentials" (Bomar, 1973, p. 23).

SPECIFIC COMPONENTS...

This structure recommendation is based upon the assumption that the Area Multitype Councils will be written into law, funded and developed. If, for any reason, the Area Multitype Councils are not established, examination centers should be administered by the present and developing intertype councils, with the full cooperation of the public library systems, the University of Wisconsin System, and school districts as represented by their local Cooperative Educational Service Agencies. The multi- or intertype sponsorship is essential if the centers are truly to serve a multitype clientele.

This concept is unique to, and important to, the library/media/education communities of Wisconsin (note the "bedrock findings" of the previous section). While other states have some cooperative sponsorship (usually the state Department of Education, or its equivalent, and a school district), there is no state which has more than an informal arrangement with the components which are not sponsors; thus, their examination centers serve primarily a school community or a public library community with some important but casual interchange with the other component and with some moderate contact with the schools of higher education. In terms of the examination center idea, a true intertype networking arrangement has yet to be founded.

FUNDING

The "core" funding for selection centers must be provided by the State. It is only the State which can assure the continuous,

equitable funding that is needed for this kind of statewide, long-range plan, that has phased, regional implementation; it is only the State which can support statewide intertype needs in a comprehensive way. When the examples of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina and other states are reviewed, State funding responsibility is not an unreasonable expectation.

After the State has met this responsibility, many additional options must be explored. While findings revealed a strong reluctance in Wisconsin to depend on federal grants or "seed" monies from any source, they also indicated an enthusiasm for supplementation of services from these kinds of sources.

Many possibilities were suggested: LSCA funds for specific projects within or among centers; various kinds of Office of Education funds, which would be awarded to the schools for specific projects involving the examination centers, for instance, ESEA IV-B and ESEA IV-C, ESEA Title IX, Education Amendments of 1974, Special Projects Act, Sec. 409, National Reading Improvement Program, Title VII, and many others limited only by the creative planning of the fund-seekers. Additionally, the National Institute for Education sponsors many funding projects.

Because the cooperative base of examination centers is so broad, there are private foundations whose grant programs are potential sources. The National Endowment for the Humanities has several divisions under which funding could be sought: Education Programs, Media Programs, Research Programs, to name a few. The Ford and Kellogg Foundations are additional possibilities. Federally

funded programs are also a source of supplementary staffing, using the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act or similar programs.

In addition to the core funding provided by the State and supplementary funding provided by federal grants and private foundations, it is recommended that the sponsoring cooperating agencies be assessed a moderate fee, partly to increase the fiscal base and partly to help ensure the principles of the right to use and the responsibility to support the examination centers as extensions of the resources of each of their own institutions. This fee plan presents a problem in that individual institutions are loath to add budgetary support to services perceived as "fringe" programs (and quick to cut them, as well); on the other hand, the legislature is reluctant to fund a statewide program that does not have the promise of local financial support. The assessment concept is sound philosophically and practically, but will need strong justification at the local institution level.

The formula for this assessment should be determined by a State level supervisory agency (the Professional Advisory Council when such is established) in conjunction with each Area Multitype Council and its examination center Board of Directors. This combination should provide a statewide overview and consistency, balanced by area considerations of individual budget needs, number and strength of participating agencies, in-kind contributions of participating agencies and other local variables.

SPECIFIC COMPONENTS...

Participating Organizations

There are three components now heavily involved in various networking and cooperative activities which would probably provide the backbone of examination center sponsorship and use.

The first of these is the schools. The majority of review and evaluation centers in other states is directed toward the school user, both the media specialist and the classroom teacher. Schools buy the widest variety of print and nonprint materials, in the greatest number, for the widest grade range. Many of the larger school districts in the State preview nonprint materials individually, a time-consuming process involving order and return; many of the smaller districts do not preview at all. Book selection is based almost exclusively on reviews. (See Appendix B, p. 89.)

Another major sponsor and user are the public libraries in the State. Interest was expressed particularly in previewing non-print materials, adult non-fiction, reference books and all juvenile materials. Many public library collections need improvement (see "Wisconsin Rationale" section), which will require support in the area of selection help. Current selection practices vary: the typical small library procedures are very different from those of the typical large one. (See Appendix B, p. 83, Note 2.)

A third major sponsor and user of examination centers is the university and college sector. Those universities and colleges in Wisconsin which have education programs and/or library/media programs are mostly in need of wider resources for their students.

Even those which have substantial collections in their IMCs or EMCs expressed great interest in having a more expanded facility for their students to use as a laboratory for extended testing, examination and research, and for the university library/media and education programs to use as review and evaluation cneters, from which to select materials for their own collections. The importance of examination centers for use in educating our future media specialists and teachers cannot be overestimated; it is these professionals who soon will be responsible for spending the school budgets and using media to support educational programs.

Another possible strong component is the vocational and technical institute as a sponsor and user. The State is divided into sixteen districts with strong institutes and programs in each of them. Because their needs tend to be very technically specific, they produce many of their own training materials. Nevertheless, these technical school faculties expressed a need for wider exposure to commercial print and nonprint media and indicated that the examination center concept would be useful to them.

An important educational organization in many parts of the State is the Cooperative Educational Service Agency. There are 19 such intermediate units in Wisconsin and, while their development is uneven, those which are thriving showed particular interest in the examination center concept. Many of them have circulating collections of their own (see "Regional Media Centers" section) and their sixteen Special Education Instructional Materials Centers service 90% of the State. In some areas, these agencies could form a strong cooperative element

in the establishment of an examination center.

A final, organized group which might be a sponsor, and would certainly be a user, of examination centers is one that does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Instruction in either its education aegis or its library one. Licensed day care programs are the responsibility of the Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Community Services; there are six DCS regions covering the State. The needs of this group of participants are great (see "Wisconsin Rationale" section); however, because they fall under a department separate from the Department of Public Instruction, their relationship as a sponsoring unit remains unclear. As individual users, they could certainly be served directly; as users of public libraries, they could and should be served indirectly.

Extending beyond these many organized groups into the community-at-large, in order to reach parents and the many adult and child educators in community services, is an important additional function, and challenge, for the regional examination center.

Collection

The scope of the collection should be based on: 1) the needs of the user groups to be served, 2) the service goals of the center in relationship to its user groups, 3) the accessibility of other resources and 4) the role each center will take in a network of centers.

Assuming that these principles are the primary and overriding

directives, planners should then recommend as wide a range of materials as appropriate, integration and balance of print and nonprint materials, a gradually accumulating retrospective collection which will serve as a backbone, "as it is impossible to carry out comparative evaluation without an adequate retrospective collection" (Bomar, 1973, p. 48). Each center should include a professional collection of standard and current monographs, journals and selection and evaluation aids of all kinds.

Since all permanent materials must be purchased, the extent of such collections will be limited by budget considerations. That restriction will help to delineate the scope and focus of each individual center.

The current collection can be acquired by preview or by purchase, or, more likely, by a combination of the methods. Bomar recommends that all materials be acquired on preview (then purchased for the collection, if desired, returned to the publisher/producer, if not), in order to avoid depending on the largesse of publishers/producers and to ensure more complete media coverage. This seems a good policy for nonprint materials and is the one used by the Pennsylvania centers. Publishers, however, are less likely to want trade books returned, and the cost of handling and mailing thousands of trade books a year is impractical. At this point, publishers are still almost universally cooperative in donating review copies, when they are sure of wide exposure and fair professional evaluation.

Producers are equally generous with preview materials, if they are assured of extensive examination possibilities, and the borrowing

institution is reliable in its handling and return of media.

Both the American Association of Publishers and the Association of Media Producers, in addition to individual companies, expressed enthusiasm about the development of regional examination centers as institutions which would improve evaluation of materials, which would reduce the need for individual library and school preview demands and which would afford an excellent opportunity for interchange with practitioners and purchasers, so that materials and marketing could be improved with benefits for all.

If, at some future time, budgets become even more restrictive, for both the purchaser of materials and the publisher/producer, a compromise plan (between all-out purchase and all-out donation) could no doubt be negotiated. In Illinois, the examination centers are paying 30% of the cost of the trade books used in their centers. This kind of agreement would need to be arranged, not center by center, but as categorical policy, worked out on the State level.

Other policies which need to be determined in advance involve the circulation of materials and the dispersal of any purchased or donated materials which are not selected for the permanent collection. In the first instance, let it be said that examination centers are, by definition, noncirculating collections. However, some examination centers do allow limited circulation for preview and field testing only. Under what circumstances this is allowed, for how long and by whom, are questions which need to be discussed and settled in advance, keeping in mind the legal requirements regarding the use of materials outside of the examination center. Infringement

of use and abuse of copyright laws are major concerns of producers. Indeed, examination centers have an ethical responsibility as depositories of large collections of materials to provide a strong and continuous program of education about the responsible use of copyrighted media.

In the second instance, some centers dispose of their unwanted materials (primarily trade books) by donating them to schools, libraries, hospitals and detention homes. Others reward the reviewer (usually a librarian or media specialist) with the review copy. Care should be used when establishing policy about disposal of books. "Free" materials can offer a strong temptation to "pad" a meager collection; unacceptable materials should not be offered to hospitals or institutional homes. Materials which are not worthy of inclusion in a core collection are not necessarily undesirable materials, by any means; however weeding and disposal guidelines should be established.

Other collection policies may develop in response to special areas of need or interest. In Pennsylvania, for example, one center has materials on State history, another has a strong high interest/low vocabulary collection, while another is developing preschool resources. These unique specializations will enrich and distinguish each center, providing its users with not only the core, not only the current, but also several collections in depth, in print and nonprint media, so that comparison and research are possible. Frances Henne (1976) states that examination centers need special collections of all kinds: historic books, books published in other countries, controversial books and even (or especially) books rejected

by teachers and librarians because they are "bad." These needs would apply just as appropriately to nonbook materials.

The collection in each examination center should not be allowed to develop by accident or default; each center needs to have policy, purpose and plans for its collection development, carefully coordinated with the other centers, so that it can best serve its cooperating sponsors, its constituent groups and the producers and publishers as well.

Staff

Needless to say, the staff in a facility which handles such a range of materials and serves such a range of library/education practitioners, would need to have unusual skills, combining a background in librarianship (with knowledge of print and nonprint media) and in education (its philosophies, methods and specialties). Administrative and organizational abilities are crucial to smooth operation; creative programming, outreach services and public relations are essential to success. The need for dynamic leadership was noted by many persons around the State as the most important characteristic of selection center staff.

No one person could fulfill every criterion, but careful selection of the complete staff, including the support personnel, can provide a solid operational basis for each center.

Each center would, of course, have a Director -- a librarian with demonstrated administrative ability who can provide the catalytic

leadership necessary to promote and establish a program of this kind. Each center needs a second professional, full-time, chosen to complement the skills and qualities of the director. A secretary, and, if the center is situated in a university setting, a project assistant or equivalent would provide major support. Student assistants or other paraprofessional workers are needed for ongoing housekeeping and program services; the number would be determined by the size and activities of the center.

Examination centers in other states often have the services of State education consultants, usually subject specialists. As centers develop, this kind of arrangement can be invaluable, with consultants serving the whole network, either as subject, format, technical or programming specialists. At some point, also, as centers are founded and established, a state-level coordinator will be needed to assist the Professional Advisory Committee in its overseeing role.

As mentioned previously, staffing can be supplemented by federally sponsored training programs, work-study students and local work-experience programs. As a final possibility, sponsoring agencies can try some cooperative staffing and sharing of personnel.

Programs and Services

Evaluation Systems

The program and services might be described as the heart, or perhaps the muscle, of any examination center, since they are what provide its life and its power. Without them, the collection becomes

a warehouse; with them, it becomes an institution which effects education and growth.

The kinds of programs and evaluation systems chosen should be based on carefully considered goals of examination centers. Is the purpose of an examination center to allow "experts" to compile buying lists from which each practitioner can choose? Is it simply to provide myriad materials and let each and every practitioner assess each and every item? These are extremes; the needs and styles of Wisconsin professionals demand a sensible middle ground which will provide a combination of helping the user with organizational aids (presenting and focusing on materials through selection tools, review files, displays) and educating the user through communication techniques (workshops, inservice programs, consultant help) and, then, allowing the user freedom to make informed decisions and to grow as an evaluator on his or her own.

Evaluation systems in other states range all the way from California, which does not have collections at all, but simply acquires the materials temporarily for state-level subject specialists to examine and recommend, to those states which have collections without programs at all -- the "dead collections." Most states fall somewhere in the middle with a variety of plans which support formal evaluation, done by center staff members, cooperating specialists or committees of professional practitioners. These evaluations are kept on file or compiled into annotated bibliographies, still a very popular and successful way of exploring quality and use and disseminating those professional judgments. With still another

method, the Capitol Region Center in Connecticut publishes a newsletter of media information and reviews.

Issues

Besides supporting the review of individual items, centers have the responsibility of looking at the larger issues of evaluation, putting each item in the context of educational and societal goals. Maryland has done this by publishing broad-based guidelines for selection. In Wisconsin, the Bureau of School Library Media Programs, in conjunction with the Cooperative Children's Book Center, has published a paper called "Suggestions for Dealing with Censorship of Media Center Materials in Schools: a Wisconsin Plan." Many centers, again including the CCBC, use workshops and inservice programs extensively to discuss in depth the issues and the goals of enlightened evaluation, against which the selection of each individual item may be placed.

Because the centers carry a broad range of materials, center staff can help practitioners develop the very different skills, knowledge and perceptions needed to judge very different kinds of materials. There is a clear distinction between evaluating children's literature and a manipulative item, between assessing a book of art reproductions and a videotape on changing car tires. Probably no person can, in fact, judge such an array of materials with accuracy and discernment. That is the reason that centers use consultants and committees; that is just another reason why the potential of the cooperative approach is sound.

SPECIFIC COMPONENTS...

Consultant Help

In terms of other services, existing hand-in-hand with these kinds of evaluation programs is the information service which must be available at all times. This means responding to telephone and drop-in inquiries with immediate consultant help and this depends on expert staff, excellent professional collections, review files and quick access to publishers' and producers' catalogs.

Auxiliary Services

Technology

Broader information services than those described above, however, could be provided by examination centers. Libraries are entering the era of technological advancements; examination centers should not only be included in the development of statewide computer technology, but could also take a leadership role in effecting its development.

Following the examples of Maryland and Pennsylvania, a center can have its holdings computerized, with print-outs available, detailing the citation and the length of time of preview. Beyond that, the permanent holdings can be placed into the OCLC data bank, as are those of most of the larger public libraries in the State, the University collections and, moving toward that, the collections of the vocational and technical colleges. Compiling union catalogs technologically is invaluable for interlibrary loan purposes, of course, and is also indispensable for cooperative collection development, an important future function for any kind of cooperative examination

center.

Regional examination centers are ideal locations for educational and library data bases of all kinds. ERIC is the most used education dissemination system, but one that is still not available to many smaller schools and libraries. The Wisconsin Dissemination Project (a five-year NIE-sponsored program) is planning to demonstrate ERIC's usefulness in four carefully-chosen CESAs around the State and to incorporate local educational programs into the ERIC service. Examination centers can cooperate with this project and help to extend its coverage even further.

Wisconsin findings also indicated interest in NICSEM (formerly NIMIS), a data base which affords access to special education materials. Directed by the National Center for Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, NICSEM is developing a master catalog and six cross-referenced indexes divided among Learning Disabilities, Mental Retardation, Speech and Hearing, Emotionally Disturbed, Physically Handicapped/Health Impaired and Visually Handicapped. As children are mainstreamed into Wisconsin public school classrooms, the importance of instant access will grow. Besides ERIC and NICSEM, there are now, and will be more, data bases (like those of the Career Information System and the New York Times) of specific relevance to educational interests.

A further technical development is the Wisconsin State Plan from the Department of Public Instruction which includes data processing centers in the Southeast, the Southwest, the Northwest and the Northeast. Examination centers would necessarily have to cooperate

and coordinate with such data processing services, in order to prevent duplication of, or gaps in, information coverage. Computer capabilities in examination centers would ensure the inclusion of children's materials, a stated concern of children's librarians in Wisconsin. These capabilities, however, must be carefully and comprehensively planned. Testimony at the Special Committee on Library Laws in April, 1978, indicated state-level emphasis on compatability and long-range responsibility in the development of computer technology around the State.

In terms of other kinds of technology, microfiche access to materials identification and retrieval systems would be an expected service. NICEM (National Information Center for Educational Media), for instance, is a valuable reference tool, as is EMCOM (Educational Media Catalogs on Microfiche) which is updated twice a year to maintain currency.

A sharp eye should also be kept on the development of cable television facilities and community access. Use of this kind of technology to extend evaluation education directly into schools, libraries and community facilities, with on-camera display and demonstration of materials, is one way of solving distance and transportation problems in a State this large.

Clearinghouse

Because the State is large and because there are numerous resources and programs being offered, the need for an information clearinghouse, yet another possible service, was strongly expressed.

Each center should take the responsibility of identifying library/media/education collections, services and activities in its own area and, in addition, those which serve the State. Center users, for instance, should have no difficulty in locating a catalog from the Bureau of Audiovisual Instruction or a listing of available materials from the African Studies Instructional Materials Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Centers should be able to provide information on the Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education also on campus in Madison; they should have film and videotape listings from the Mendota Mental Health Institute Library-Media Center, a checklist of materials compiled by the Central Wisconsin Center for the Developmentally Disabled, descriptive handouts on the Fox Valley Special Education Instructional Materials Center and information on upcoming programming on NEWIST (Northeastern Wisconsin In-School Telecommunications), as well as other educational broadcasting. These examples only begin to indicate the quantity of information available on various educational resources.

In addition to disseminating this kind of materials-information, centers might very well collect locally-produced materials which would be available for purchase or loan. According to a University of Wisconsin-Extension Communications survey, there are 23 local areas in which videotapes are made for cable broadcast (Educational Uses of Cable Television, 1976); these tapes might be made available for viewing and duplication. The Fox Valley SEIMC produces materials which should be available for review and evaluation, along with similar commercial materials.

The centers can act as regional screening locations for use by the Wisconsin Film Circuit; they can support with materials and extend into other communities such excellent educational programs as the Multicultural Workshop offered in Racine. The possibilities of cooperation, not only with libraries and media centers, but with other educational, literary and cultural resources is limited only by other clearinghouse services already accessible and by the creativity and ambition of the center leadership.

Research

A final area of service possibility lies in the direction of research. As centers become established and their collections grow in depth and breadth, they will naturally provide a resource and a climate for practical and theoretical investigation by students, scholars, practitioners, writers, artists and even, perhaps, by producers and publishers. This function of research can have, as its ultimate effect, a corollary goal to that of examination centers themselves, and that is the improvement of the quality of materials and, thus, the improvement of education, whether formal or informal.

Practical Considerations: Fixed Site and Mobile Services

Choosing a site for an examination center involves many of the same considerations that choosing a site for a library or any other kind of community resource involves. It needs to be centrally and conveniently located; accessible, preferably by public transportation

as well as automobile; it needs to have parking facilities; it needs to be large enough to accommodate growth (at least 5000 square feet to start); it needs to be safely built, well-lit, ventilated and attractive; it needs to have adequate electrical wiring and outlets; and it needs to be economically affordable. The many factors and variables in the determination of a site location require expert knowledge and specialized study for each and every center.

In addition, the nature of the cooperative centers discussed here adds some factors which might alleviate location problems or, alternatively, exacerbate them. A site must satisfy all the cooperating agencies, not just in terms of physical location, but in terms of psychological access. For instance, if a site is found on a university campus, it must be determined whether public librarians, school staff and other users will feel free to use it. If a vacant public school site is chosen, is it in a neighborhood whose ambience encourages access and where students and faculty will leave their campus comforts to study and meet? While excellent, dynamic, well-publicized services are the factors that will ultimately determine the success of a center, this success can be achieved more easily and economically if care is taken to support, rather than sabotage, the program by making thoughtful choices about practical and physical considerations.

First and last, the geographic location itself must be determined by the area to be served: 1) the number and kinds of library and education institutions which would support and use a center and 2) the over-all constituent population, its number and its needs.

This population must be large enough and unserved enough to justify an on-site facility.

Responses indicated that most library and education personnel could not and would not travel more than one hour a few times a year to visit a center simply for examination purposes; they would travel as much as an hour-and-a-half less frequently (once or twice a year) for programs and workshops. Released or inservice time and paid travel increase the amount-of-use estimates considerably, as do providing evening and week-end accessibility.

These time and distance factors, as they deter access, must be recognized by the State Department of Public Instruction. That Department must make a commitment, along with the development of the centers, to actively encourage school and library administrators to create convenient and practical arrangements for regular use of the centers by their staffs. Whether an area could sustain a center or whether it would be better served by mobile units is a determination that will need extended study, region by region.

Mobile services are entering a period of increased investigation and consideration. The Weston Woods Children's Caravan Mediamobile is demonstrating a variety of exciting and economical uses for mobile units. Other customized mobile service vehicles are being designed and utilized by the New Mexico State Library. An upcoming PLA Reporter will devote a whole issue to new developments in mobile unit design and more economical fuel systems for them. Like the examination center concept, the mobile services concept needs to be re-studied and re-evaluated in terms of cooperative, and ultimately,

cost-effective, service to library/media/education communities. Cost-effective, as stated by Richard Sorenson at an AASL networking meeting, does not mean cost-saving: "It means making money work harder and count for more."

Budget

Budget is another area that requires very specific and expert study in relationship to the exact service being proposed; in other words, "what is being built," "where it is being built" and, in inflationary periods, "when it is being built" become very important factors. Budget figures from other centers are often buried in larger services or in the complexities of cooperative funding, circumstances which make the data difficult to retrieve. In addition, the figures from those states where data is available represent services, collections and programs which might, or might not, be duplicated in Wisconsin. All of the figures that follow must be judged in this context and must be viewed as estimates, functioning only as guidelines for later detailed study in Wisconsin.

The Maryland center in Anne Arundel County is budgeted for $55,000 for 1977-78, raised $5,000 from the previous year. This center was built on a trade book examination collection already functioning in the County district; the Director of School Media Services for the State, David Bender, estimates that "starting from scratch" would cost $100,000. Pennsylvania's examination center in Kingston, Pennsylvania, had a projected budget for 1977-78 of $47,000.

SPECIFIC COMPONENTS...

Connecticut's Capitol Region Center spends approximately $100,000 per year, with 50% for staff, 25% for overhead and 25% for materials. North Carolina spends between $63,000 and $75,000 per year for its state examination center and services. While these figures are far from precise, they do represent current estimates of active, successful examination programs. Even in 1973, Bomar projected figures totalling $105,000 for the initial year of operation (pp. 95-96), with fairly specific category breakdowns. This list, together with up-to-date estimates of the complete program, can provide a basis on which to develop detailed budget figures in respect to specific kinds and locations of centers in Wisconsin.

Chapter Ten

RECOMMENDATIONS

As shown in the section on "Wisconsin Rationale," and the survey statistics on selection-method preference, this State has shown undeniable evidence of interest, support and need in regard to improving selection and examination capabilities in the State. The librarians, media specialists and educators of Wisconsin deserve no less than those of other forward-looking states who are receiving substantial help in performing the gargantuan task of identifying, organizing and evaluating, with knowledge and sensitivity, the myriad materials on which they spend many hundreds of thousands of dollars per year. For equitable selection help, Wisconsin needs a statewide system, based on a network of examination centers, which will provide both the many materials and the corresponding programs for helping all purchasers make informed and appropriate choices for their communities. Such a system, cooperatively organized and coordinated with other State resources, will provide Wisconsin professionals with equal access to information and assistance.

Principles

In establishing a system of centers, planners must keep in mind some cardinal principles: first, that the design of the system be done within the context of the Report of the Task Force on Intertype Cooperation and Resource Sharing (even as it evolves), just as the work of the Task Force was done within the context of the work of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; second, that the planning be done based on determination of long-range goals (formulated by the Area Multitype Councils, the Professional Advisory Committee and the Council on Library Development and Networking) with provision for flexibility and continuous evaluation and local feedback; and, third, that the "bedrock findings" in the section called "Overview of Examination Center Development" be valued and heeded.

Recommendations

Here, then, based on these same principles, is a broad framework of recommendations on which to hang further study and development:

One. The Madison area is resource-rich. It is so rich that it was the one area in the State to display only moderate interest in the examination center concept. Nevertheless, its resources are scattered, uncoordinated and usually unknown except to the clientele of the sponsoring institution.

The exception to this isolation is, of course, the Cooperative

Children's Book Center, which is used by a wide variety of librarians and educators. The Center, unique in its collections and its cooperative State and University support, has achieved high visibility and appreciative response from users around the State under the leadership of the current librarian. The CCBC Executive Board is in the process, now that permanent funding has been secured, of reformulating goals and objectives for the Center.

Other strong collections in the area include: the Instructional Materials Center of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison, which has a broad collection of classroom, text and instructional materials now being reclassified, using the Library of Congress system, and being placed into the OCLC data base; and the Madison Metropolitan School District Instructional Materials Library which functions as an examination center for Madison Public Schools and some nearby school districts, and is considering shifting focus to text and nonprint instructional materials only and using the CCBC for trade book examination. There are many other specialized collections, on campus and in the surrounding institutions, each one basically serving only its own clientele, and each having evolved because its clientele needed hands-on examination opportunity in a specialized field.

None of these collections, alone, fits the basic definition of an examination center, but, tied together under the supervision of an Area Multitype Council, they could serve a broader base of examination users by being strengthened, coordinated, opened up and publicized. Organized in this way, they could serve that area

covered by the Madison Area Library Council, which now includes Dane, Sauk and Green Counties, as one kind of examination center model -- that of strengthening, coordinating and sharing resources that already exist.

Immediate steps toward this end would be to 1) extend the LSCA grant awarded to the South Central Library System and the Madison Area Library Council for the purpose of community cooperation, so that a full-time person can explore, among other things, materials and resources, collection development, examination and evaluation practices and needs, and can begin to make recommendations for the coordination of these facilities; 2) secure funding for strengthening collections and services that can be used for examination purposes in those areas (textbook, non-print, instructional and AV materials, adult education) which are not covered by the CCBC collections; 3) appoint a representative of the Madison Area Library Council to the Executive Board of the CCBC, after the present Executive Board has reformulated its goals and objectives; and 4) secure funding for the position of CCBC director from the State for the purpose of: a) initiating the development of the basic management structure as described on page 41, b) assuming responsibility for the "core" funding as described on pages 42 and 43, c) enabling intertype coordination both locally and statewide, d) enabling expansion of the CCBC professional staff.

All of these strengthening and coordinating activities would fall under the jurisdiction of an Area Multitype Council, as previously described, when such councils are formed and funded. However, in the event that that does not occur, there is no need to wait to implement

any of these recommendations for improving the opportunities to review and evaluate materials in the Madison area, since each recommendation is modest in scope and expense.

Two. The far North is resource poor. The use of the CCBC by persons north of the Eau Claire, Wausau, Green Bay line is infrequent. Other resources do not exist, except for the University of Wisconsin-Superior, very far west, Northland College in Ashland, very far north, and Nicolet College and Technical Institute, centrally located in the north, in Rhinelander.

Mobile services for the purpose of materials review and evaluation are needed by media specialists and teachers in the schools and by librarians in the small public libraries. Such a service should be: based in a convenient town, preferably in conjunction with a cooperating library of education agency; started on a moderate scale, carrying perhaps 2,500 items; have both a self-contained and a break-down display for use in cooperation with schools, libraries, and community centers; and organized by subject matter or materials format or simply by currency, but include core materials for demonstration and reference.

The staffing and programming of such a service are no less important than for a stationary center. Programs and collections must be carefully coordinated with the needs of the schools, public libraries and other community agencies. They might also be coordinated with the well-established bookmobile service of the Northwest Wisconsin Library System and with the new outreach education program of the University of Wisconsin-Superior.

While the population of the Northern third of the State is small in comparison to that of the Southeast, unfortunately, library resources and services are not equitably proportionate. Demographic statistics show that the area is healthy and growing; the development of the copper mines will increase the growth trend. Therefore, even though at this time, there is no intertype council to administer a program, development of examination services is recommended immediately upon the establishment of such a council. In the event that an Area Multitype Council does not get funded and developed, other means of administration must be explored by the Wisconsin Valley Library Service, the Northwest Wisconsin Library System, the Nicolet Federated Library System, the Indianhead Library System, the University of Wisconsin-Superior, Nicolet College and Technical Institute and an informal (unnamed) organization of intertype librarians in the Rhinelander area, with all of these groups under the leadership of the Division for Library Services.

Three. One stationary center, housing a wide range of materials and serving multitype institutions in a radius of 60 to 80 miles should be established in a carefully selected location as soon as funding can be secured.

This center should be located in an area which can depend on strong cooperating agencies, preferably including an intertype council, a university library/media or education department, a public library system headquarters, a large school district, a vocational college, a CESA headquarters and a day care service region headquarters; just as feasible, however, is an area without some of

these components, but with a strong pattern of intertype cooperation already established. This center would be, of those recommended so far, most like those in other states and most like those recommended by Bomar.

Using Bomar's guidelines and based on the findings and recommendations made throughout this report, this center, along with the mobile services model in the North and the strengthening-and-coordinating model in the South Central area, would serve as pilots for the further development of examination centers in the State. After a period of no less than two years and no more than four years of operation, each concept must be studied, evaluated and analyzed for its strengths and weaknesses, so that appropriate application of that model can be used elsewhere.

For instance, the concept of strengthening-and-coordinating might be especially suitable for the Milwuakee area, with its many resources, its public library system and its established intertype council. After scrutiny and analysis of each pilot, the South Central area, depending on the directions of development of the CCBC, may opt for a multimedia, stationary center or continued coordination of existing resources or, possibly, the extension of services with a mobile unit. Based on the evaluation of services in the North, mobile services might be successfully duplicated in several areas of the State. Their effectiveness (in service and cost) would determine the number of centers ultimately needed in order for all of Wisconsin's libraries and schools to be equitably served. That number (of centers) need not coincide with the number of Area Multitype Councils; several

Councils might combine to administer one center, if only one center is needed for complete service of a given area.

Preceding all of this recommended development, however, must be further study. In-depth investigation of the centers in Indiana, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North Carolina and Connecticut would result in time- and money-saving information and guidance. While each center is successful, each is funded differently, structured differently, serves different communities and each is eager to expand and strengthen its programs. A second focus of investigation would necessarily be those geographic areas of the State suggested for immediate development; specific, detailed plans and recommendations (including cost analysis, funding specifications, exact staffing and administrative patterns) would result from this study. The Division for Library Services should take responsibility for this further investigation so that it is completed in time for the next State biennium.

Summary of Action Agenda

In summary, the steps toward development of intertype examination centers in Wisconsin are these:

1. Further, specific study of a) successful out-of-state centers and b) those areas in-state especially recommended for development, with both studies resulting in detailed plans for each of the three pilot programs.
2. Based on the findings in this report and the detailed plans

from step 1, development of three pilot programs a) the strengthening-and-coordinating model in the Madison Area Library Council area, b) the mobile services model in Northern Wisconsin and c) a stationary center to be determined by this study, based on the criteria in this report.

3. Assessment of these models, analyzing both their unique and common characteristics for the purpose of determining future development of the models and appropriate application of the models in other areas of the State.
4. Development of the full network of centers, based on the analysis of the three models, so that the entire State is provided with equitable opportunities for review and evaluation of a broad array of materials.

Chapter Eleven

CONCLUSION

Establishing Cooperative Materials Examination Centers in Wisconsin, as part of an intertype network means more than simply enlarging the opportunities for the State's librarians, media specialists and educators to review and select. While this opportunity is indisputably needed, the results of providing these kinds of environments, with strong education programs and cooperation from many areas of sponsorship, each with its unique contribution, will show great and broad dividends.

Conscientious and thoughtful materials evaluation, based on skill, perception and ever-increasing knowledge, affect the entire institution for which material is being selected. Frances Henne says that accessibility means accessibility, not just of materials, but of ideas, knowledge and experience, as well (1976).

The skills of evaluation and selection are necessary for each of us as private individuals, surrounded as we are by information and media. These skills, and knowledge of the issues on which they are based, can be passed on to the children and clientele who use the materials provided for them in libraries and schools; they, too, are affected by media "overload" and need to learn how to evaluate and

select outside of the library and the school.

Finally, the chance for "cross-pollination," for the enrichment provided by many cooperating components, for the flexibility to encompass a new form of functioning and service, -- this chance can catalyze growth, not just change. W. Lyle Eberhart, Assistant Superintendent and Administrator, Division for Library Services, says "to achieve this goal (of true multitype systems) will require the creation of a different form of governing structure, and of different kinds of librarians..." (Eberhart, 1978). D. Philip Baker says, in speaking of children's media programs, "To achieve success requires profound changes in our attitudes and abilities as professionals and as people. It means implementing the concept of cooperative educational communities involving a wide variety of public institutions, of which schools and public libraries will be only two members" (1977, p. 67).

Cooperative Materials Examination Centers, their establishment and their success, can function as both the challenge and the medium to accomplish goals of many kinds expressed in many areas of the library/education community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

COOPERATIVE MATERIALS EVALUATION CENTERS

Aaron, Shirley. Personalizing instruction for the middle school learner: the instructional role of the school media specialist. Tallahassee, Fla.: Career Education Center, Fla. State University, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 115 276).

Action exchange. American Libraries, May 1978, p. 259.

Adegbalola, Gaye Todd. Teaching science with little equipment ... and lots of media. Audiovisual Instruction, February 1978, pp. 38-41.

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Media programs: district and school. Chicago: American Library Association and Washington, D.C.: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1975.

Association of Media Producers. Survey and analysis of 1976 educational media sales. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1977.

Association of Media Producers (Producer), To help them learn. Washington, D.C.: Association of Media Producers and Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1978. (Film).

Baker, D. Philip. School and public library media programs for children and young adults. Syracuse, N.Y.: Gaylord, 1972.

Bender, David. Cooperative planning for school media program development. School Media Quarterly, 1975, 3, 115-120.

Bomar, Cora Paul. Guide to the development of educational media selection centers. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

Comprehensive long-range program for library services in Wisconsin. Wisconsin Library Bulletin. September-October 1977 (whole issue).

Cox, Carl T. Current research. School Media Quarterly, 1973, 2, 60-63.

Davies, Ruth Ann. The school library media center: a force for educational excellence. New York: Bowker, 1974.

Doebler, Paul D. Record pubmart crowd hears industry leaders' predictions. Publishers Weekly, May 8, 1978, pp. 38-40.

Dresang, Eliza. Special user needs defined. WSLMA Communique, May 1978, p. 3.

Eberhart, W. Lyle. Multitype cooperation in Wisconsin -- the DLS position. Channel DLS, March 3, 1978, p. 1.

Edmister, Patricia. Establishing a parent education resource center. Childhood Education, November-December 1977, pp. 62-66.

Educational Research Service, Inc. Procedures for textbook and instructional materials selection. Arlington, Va.: Author, 1976.

Fiske, Edward R. Centers where teachers charge their batteries. New York Times. December 18, 1977, Sec. IV, p. 9.

Future bright for regional agencies, if... Education, USA. March 20, 1978, p. 220.

Gaver, Mary Virginia. A report in progress: dreamers and educational media selection centers. Wilson Library Bulletin, 1974, 48, 652-659.

Gladysz, Margeau. Facilitating the positive image ... a materials examination center in action. Media Spectrum. First quarter 1977, pp. 5-6.

Harris, Shirley A. The teacher center in Illinois: a different way to grow. Madison, Wi.: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1977. (Bulletin No. 7421).

Henne, Francis E. The library world and the publishing of children's books. (Third of the R.R. Bowker Memorial Lectures, New Series, November 6, 1975). New York: Bowker, 1976.

Hicks, Warren B. & Tillin, Alma M. Developing multi-media libraries. New York: Bowker, 1970.

Hoffman, Elizabeth P. School library media centers -- educators toolboxes: a look at Pennsylvania's examination centers. Pennsylvania Library Association Bulletin, September 1975, pp. 94-95.

---------- You're in the AV now: not books alone. Wilson Library Bulletin, 1976, 50, 338-340.

Kaplan, Leonard. Teacher centers: the state of the scene. The High School Journal, 1978, 61, 143-149.

Licensed day care in Wisconsin, 1977. Madison, Wi.: Wisconsin Department of Health & Social Services, Division of Community Services, 1977.

Moskowitz, Adeline. The relationship between the teachers' educational preparation in children's literature and the time devoted to children's literature in their classrooms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers' College, 1976. (Xerox University Microfilms, No. 77-4194).

Murphy, Thomas J. AAP on the offensive -- the school division wages a public information campaign. Publishers Weekly, April 17, 1978, pp. 57-58.

NSAIM: two years later. EPIEgram, December 1, 1976, pp. 1-2.

Nystrom, Lois J. 1976 multi-media evaluation report. Bloomfield, Conn.: Capitol Region Education Council, Metro Media Evaluation Center, Windsor, Connecticut, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 390).

Osso, Nicholas. Statistics of public school libraries/media centers, Fall, 1974. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education Division, National Center for Education Statistics, 1977. (NCES 77-203)

Paul, Sandra K. & Nemeyer, Carol A. Book marketing and selection: selected findings from the current AAP/ALA study. Publishers Weekly, June 16, 1975, pp. 42-45.

Public library and school library organizational relationships and interlibrary cooperation: a policy statement. Madison, Wi.: Department of Public Instruction, Division for Library Services, 1976.

Planning for instructional media programs: 1977-82. Madison, Wi.: Department of Public Instruction, 1977. (Bulletin No. 9169).

Professional growth opportunities: 1977-78 first semester inservice courses and elective sessions. Madison, Wi.: Madison Metropolitan School District, The Madison Exchange, 1977.

Report on a national study of the nature and the quality of instructional materials most used by teachers and learners. New York: EPIE Institute, 1977. (EPIE Report, No. 76).

Richter, Jane. Center stage. Pennsylvania Library Association Bulletin, September 1976, pp. 115-116.

Roth, Edith Brill. A first and only treasure. American Education, November 1977, pp. 6-9.

Rowell, John & Heidbreder, Ann. Educational media selection centers: identification and analysis of current practices. Chicago: American Library Association, 1971.

Rules for licensing day care centers for children, Madison, Wi.: Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Community Services, 1971.

School Media Quarterly, 1977, 6(1, Whole issue on networking, data bases, and media programs).

School Media Quarterly, 1978, 6(2, Whole issue on AAP/RTSD/AASL survey).

School Media Quarterly, 1978, 6(3, Whole issue on AAP/RTSD/AASL survey).

School-public library services within a community; problems and questions on consolidation: a policy statement. Madison, Wi.: Department of Public Instruction, Division for Library Services, 1976.

Standards for instructional media programs 1977-82. Madison, Wi.: Department of Public Instruction, Division for Library Services, 1977. (Bulletin No. 9174).

Task Force on Interlibrary Cooperation and Resource Sharing. Interlibrary cooperation: a Wisconsin plan. Madison, Wi.: Department of Public Instruction, Division for Library Services, 1976. (Bulletin No. 7069).

Thompson, Barbara, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Where have we been and where are we going. (Speech, CESA Boards of Control and Coordinators Conference) Stevens Point, Wi.: December 10, 1975.

Trends in education: instructional materials and teaching. EPIEgram, February 1, 1978, p. 3.

University of Wisconsin-Extension. Educational uses of cable television in Wisconsin: March, 1976. Madison, Wi.: Author, 1976.

Wentroth, Mary Ann. A juvenile book evaluation center for the state. Oklahoma Librarian, April 1975, pp. 36-38.

Wisconsin Library Bulletin. November-December, 1976 (Whole issue on resource sharing).

Wisconsin Library Bulletin. November-December, 1977 (Whole issue on library cooperation).

PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN REGARD TO

OVER-ALL CONCEPTS, OR SPECIFIC ASPECTS,

OF EXAMINATION CENTERS

Mary Adams, La Crosse County Library System
Elaine Anderson, Beaver Dam Public Schools
James Anderson, Teacher Center, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
Edward Austin, Northwest Wisconsin Library System, Ashland
Jack Baillie, Nebraska Department of Education
Thomas Barrett, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Alice Bartz, Eastern Area Branch Examination Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Wayne Bassett (and staff), Marathon County Public Library, Wausau
Charles Bates, Mid-Wisconsin Library System
Lucy Beck, Gilbert M. Simmons Public Library, Kenosha
Patt Behler, Missouri State Library
Tekla Bekkedal, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
David R. Bender, Maryland State Department of Education
Annette L. Blanchette, University of Wisconsin-River Falls
Eugene Boart, Moraine Park Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Institute
Melvin Bollum, CESA #14, Fennimore
Maxine Boyce, Bureau of Audiovisual Instruction, Madison
Robert Boyd, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Margaret Branson, Division for Library Services, Madison
Susan Bresnick, Madison Metropolitan School District
Henry Bucher, African Studies Instructional Materials Center, Madison
John Bullis, La Crosse Public Schools
Elizabeth Burr, Madison
Carolyn Cain, Madison Metropolitan School District
Yvonne Carter, United States Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
Ann Clark, Madison
Vergie F. Cox, North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction
Mary Cronin, Library Council of Metropolitan Milwaukee
J. Joseph Daly, Minnesota Instructional Materials Center
Gerald Daniels, University of Wisconsin-Platteville
John David, CESA #9, Green Bay
Sally Davis, Oconomowoc Public School District
Bruce Dewey, Bureau of Audiovisual Instruction, Madison
Sally Drew, Division for Library Services, Madison
W. Lyle Eberhart, Division for Library Services, Madison
Carol Brown Eilber, University of Wisconsin-Extension
Jenelle Elder, Milwaukee Public Schools
Nancy Elsmo, Racine Public Library

PERSONS INTERVIEWED...

Loretta Farris, Northeastern Area Branch Examination Center, Kingston, Pennsylvania
Frederick Finley, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Cliffor Fortin, University of Wisconsin-River Falls
Maryfaith Fox, Madison Metropolitan School District
Tina Fu, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
Muriel Fuller, Madison
Maureen Gaffney, Media Center for Children, New York City
Iris Glidden, West Bend School District
Edward C. Gollnick, Wisconsin Education Association Council, Madison
Lee Goodheart, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
Ronald Gorsegnor, Nicolet Federated Library System, Green Bay
Gerald Green, Special Education Instructional Materials Center, Oshkosh
Janice A. Greenstein, Specialized Office 3, Madison
William Grindeland, Racine Unified School District
Margaret Tielke Grinnell, Mendota Mental Health Institute, Madison
Lyle Grooters, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
Barbara L. Hanaway, Madison Area Library Council
Carol M. Hansen, South Asian Area Center, Madison
Loretta Harmatuck, Wisconsin Dissemination Project, Madison
Gertrude B. Herman, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Elizabeth P. Hoffman, Havertown, Pennsylvania
Rose Holmes, Madison Metropolitan School District
Suzanne Isaacs, Association of Media Producers, Chicago
John Jax, University of Wisconsin-Stout
Norma Jones, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
Donald Jorgenson, Manitowoc Public School District
Barbara Kelly (and staff), Manitowoc-Calumet Counties Federated Library System
Kathy Kish, Guidance Associates, New York City
James R. Klein, Appleton School District
Ronald Korsgaard, University of Wisconsin-River Falls
Helen Kreigh, Division for Library Services, Madison
Harold Krubsack, Southwest Wisconsin Vocational and Technical Institute
Richard Krumwiede (and staff), Outagamie-Waupaca Counties Federated Library System
Kate Kruschwitz, Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
Ginny Moore Kruse, Cooperative Children's Book Center, Madison
Bridget Lamont, Illinois State Library
Phyllis Land, Indiana State Department of Education
Keith Lea (and staff), University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Mary Elizabeth Ledlie, Milwaukee Public Library
Al Lindgren, Moraine Park Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Institute
David Logan, Waisman Resource Center, Madison
James J. McCarthy, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Shirley May McConnell, South Central Library System, Madison
Leora McGee, Milwaukee Public School District
Mary McNulty, American Association of Publishers, New York City
Marianna Markewitz (and staff), University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Dean Markwardt (and staff), Marshfield Public Schools

PERSONS INTERVIEWED...

Mary Stuart Mason, Virginia State Department of Education
Geraldine M. Matthews, Central Wisconsin Center for the Developmentally Disabled
Helen Mattison, Broward County Schools District, Fort Lauderdale, Florida
Minne Motz, Library Consultant, New York City
Ralph Munger, District Technical Institute, Eau Claire
James A. Nelson, University of Wisconsin-Extension, Madison
Carol A. Nemeyer, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Kathy Norris, Rock County Library System
Lois Nystrom, Connecticut Capitol Region Education Council, Hartford, Connecticut
John Olescynk, Rice Lake School District
Linda Olson, University of Wisconsin-Stout
Roger L. Pearson, South Central Library System, Madison
Elizabeth Peltola, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Virginia Perez, Winnefox Library System, Oshkosh
Daphne Philos, Association of Media Producers, Washington, D.C.
Rosa L. Presberry, Maryland State Department of Education
Joseph Pritchard, University of Wisconsin-Superior
John Proctor (and staff), Eau Claire Public Library
Warren Randall, Eau Claire School District
Marijane Reich, Mendota Mental Health Institute, Madison
Richard Reihl (and staff), Lakeshore Technical Institute, Cleveland, Wisconsin
Carol Reinagle, Rice Lake School District
Ilene Rewerts, Eau Claire School District
Sandra Robbers, Southwest Wisconsin Library System, Fennimore
Donald Roberts, Pyramid Films, Minneapolis
James Roberts, New Mexico State Library
Kurt Rothe, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay; Northeast Wisconsin Intertype Libraries
Marcis Sarnowski, La Crosse Area Library System
Philip Q. Sawin, Jr., University of Wisconsin-Stout
Nancy Schindel (and staff), Weston Woods Studios, Weston, Connecticut
Dwayne Schmaltz (and staff), CESA #13, Waupun
Leslyn Schmidt, Wauwatosa Public Library
Eugenia Schmitz, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
Mary Alice Seemeyer, Tri-County Library Council
Loren Sgro (and staff), Nicolet College and Technical Institute, Rhinelander
Ronald Sigler, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Woodrow Sizer, CESA #1, Ashland
Maureen Skegy, Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Community Services, Madison
Roland Solberg, CESA #11, La Crosse
Gerald Sommers (and staff), Brown County Library, Green Bay
James J. Sorenson, Green Bay Public School District
Richard Sorenson, Division for Library Serivces, Madison
Dilys Spransy, Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Community Services, Milwaukee

PERSONS INTERVIEWED...

Merle Strong, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Thomas L. Swenson, Madison Metropolitan School District
Myra Thomas, Educational Materials Review Center, Washington, D.C.
Glenn Thompson, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Mary Travillian, Iowa Regional Media Center, Marshalltown, Iowa
Kathleen Weibel, Madison,
James White, La Crosse Public Library
Ralph Whiting, Division for Library Services, Madison
Jay Wilson, Manitowoc Public School District
Lowell Wilson, Janesville Public School District
Mary L. Woodworth, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Jane Younger, Division for Library Services, Madison
Ed Zeimet, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
Ledell Zellers, Mendota Mental Health Institute, Madison

Appendix B

SURVEY NOTES

1. The survey was sent to 200 school media centers; responses were received from 70 elementary schools, 30 middle and junior high schools and 51 high schools. They were tabulated separately by group. Questionnaires were sent to 200 public libraries: responses were received from 32 large libraries (those listed in the Wisconsin Service Record as having five or more staff) and from 104 small libraries (those having staff of four or less). As with the school media centers, the public libraries were tabulated by group. The data was then combined for the final figures.

   The percentage of return was 74.5, with 72 percent usable returns. The survey results represent 75.5% of school media centers queried; it represents 68% of public libraries queried.

2. As compared to the larger public libraries, the smaller public libraries rely heavily on personal recommendations, other library collections, book and record store stock, book clubs, commercial exhibits and mobile unit displays for help in selecting materials for their libraries. Also, comparatively speaking, they purchase few nonprint materials; those small libraries in systems depend upon that system for almost all of their nonprint materials. Those which are not in systems and cannot afford to purchase nonprint simply do not have any. (See Appendix B, p. 93).

3. The responses to Questions 19 and 20 represent some overlap of roles. For instance, in a small public library, the librarian is also the director. This accounts for the answer to "f", which shows only 50% of public librarians rating themselves as "selector;" they missing percentage can be found, in part, in "b".

4. In Question 28, the "committee" response was not broken down consistently by respondents. On those questionnaires on which "committee" was checked, all other responses were cancelled, on the assumption that the other responses duplicated, in part, the committee members. Therefore, all other categories were checked separately and were not included in committee membership; "committee" is a category equal in weight to the others.

Total response: 72%: School media centers 75% Public libraries 68%

QUESTIONNAIRE

for

PUBLIC LIBRARIES and SCHOOL MEDIA CENTERS

from

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTER

Figures are in percentages. First figure is school media center; second figure is public library response.

1. I am responding for a (Check ONE)
   - ___ public library (1)
   - ___ elementary school media center (2)
   - ___ middle school/junior high media center (3)
   - ___ high school media center (4)

2. What is the number of books in your library/IMC? (Check closest amount)

1	4	Under 2,000	(1)	4	22	20,000-50,000	(4)	-	1	200,000-500,000	(7)
54	35	2,000-10,000	(2)	1	10	50,000-100,000	(5)	-	-	Over 500,000	(8)
40	20	10,000-20,000	(3)	-	8	100,000-200,000	(6)				

3. What is the number of non-print items in your library/IMC? (Check closest amount)

1	1	None									
3	18	Under 50	(1)	32	10	1,000-2,500	(4)	3	1	10,000-25,000	(7)
8	25	50-200	(2)	15	8	2,500-5,000	(5)	-	1	Over 25,000	(8)
33	29	200-1,000	(3)	4	4	5,000-10,000	(6)	2	1	NA	

4. What is the number of periodical subscriptions in your library/IMC? (Check closest amount)

4	10	Under 10	(1)	26	23	25-50	(3)	17	17	100-250	(5)
25	17	10-25	(2)	26	21	50-100	(4)	1	11	Over 250	(6)
								1	1	NA	

5. What is the number of "rental" items used in your library/IMC per year? (For instance, films from the film circuit or Josten-type-plan books.) (Check closest amount)

36	51	None	(1)	14	10	100-200	(3)	3	5	500-1,000	(5)
29	22	Under 100	(2)	9	9	200-500	(4)	2	1	Over 1,000	(6)
								7	1	NA	

6. Provide approximate amount for last full budget year for purchase of books. (Check closest amount)

-	7	Under $200	(1)	13	18	$5,000-$10,000	(4)	-	7	$50,000-$100,000	(7)
9	21	$200-$1,000	(2)	4	7	$10,000-$20,000	(5)	-	1	$100,000-$175,000	(8)
73	30	$1,000-$5,000	(3)	1	8	$20,000-$50,000	(6)	-	-	Over $175,000	(9)
								-	1	NA	

7. Provide approximate amount for last full budget year for purchase of non-print items. (Check closest amount)

-	4	None									
9	43	Under $200	(1)	3	4	$5,000-$10,000	(4)	-	-	$50,000-$100,000	(7)
26	28	$200-$1,000	(2)	4	2	$10,000-$20,000	(5)	-	-	$100,000-$175,000	(8)
56	15	$1,000-$5,000	(3)	-	1	$20,000-$50,000	(6)	-	-	Over $175,000	(9)
								1	1	NA	

------*Questionnaire continues on back of this page.....*

83

8. Provide approximate amount for last full budget year for purchase of periodical subscriptions. (Check closest amount)

1	4	None	(1)	15	9	$125-$250	(4)	18	15	$1,000-$2,500	(7)
2	9	Under $50	(2)	26	18	$250-$500	(5)	5	7	$2,500-$5,000	(8)
9	14	$50-$125	(3)	24	14	$500-$1,000	(6)	-	7	Over $5,000	(9)
								1	3	NA	

9. Provide approximate amount for last full budget year for "rental" of items. (For example, fees for film circuit films or Josten-type-plan books) (Check closest amount)

33	51	None						
13	23	Under $250	(1)	9	7	$500-$1,000	(3)	2	1	$5,000-$10,000	(5)
16	3	$250-$500	(2)	13	9	$1,000-$5,000	(4)			Over $10,000	(6)
								14	7	NA	

10. How many potential users is your library/IMC funded to serve? (Check closest number)

PUBLIC LIBRARIES only Community population is: (a)			SCHOOL MEDIA CENTERS only Student enrollment is: (b)		
32	Under 2,000	(1)	5	Under 200	(1)
37	2,000-10,000	(2)	48	200-500	(2)
21	10,000-50,000	(3)	28	500-1,000	(3)
7	50,000-150,000	(4)	12	1,000-2,500	(4)
2	Over 150,000	(5)		Over 2,500	(5)
			7	NA	

11. How many hours per week is your library/IMC staffed and open to public/students? (Check closest number)

1	2	Under 5 hours	(1)	4	21	15-25 hours	(3)	22	26	40-65 hours	(5)
9	19	5-15 hours	(2)	63	18	25-40 hours	(4)	-	13	Over 65 hours	(6)
								1	-	NA	

12. Indicate below the number of paid employees in your library/IMC at this time. Next, indicate the education level (actually attained, not required) of each paid employee.

Category (Indicate below total number in each category:	Education Level (Indicate number of employees at each level of educatic Less than Bachelor's	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Degree in Library and/or Media	Other Gre uate Degr
a. Full-Time Professional Employees ___	THE RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTION WERE TOO ERRATIC TO BE TABULATED.			
b. Part-Time Professional Employees ___				
c. Full-Time Paraprofessional Employees ___				
d. Part-Time Paraprofessional Employees ___				

13. In what kinds of library/media continuing education activities does the staff (professional and paraprofessional) participate? (Check any which apply)

None 13 | 3
NA 8 | 11

% of Activities	Continuing Education Activities — Actual # of persons participating:	Indicate number of staff persons participating during last full year: 1-4	5-15	over 15	NA
a. 52 | 20	University or college courses	73 | 23	- | 2	- | -	5 | 2
b. 6 | 5	Vocational/technical college courses	8 | 6	- | -	- | -	1 | 1
c. 18 | 19	University of Wisconsin-Extension courses	25 | 21	- | 3	- | -	3 | 2
d. 31 | 60	Educational Telephone Network courses	44 | 57	- | 13	- | 2	3 | 10
e. 38 | 73	Workshops sponsored by system/district	55 | 70	2 | 11	- | 4	1 | 14
f. 47 | 36	Workshops sponsored by professional groups	69 | 33	1 | 9	- | 2	1 | 6
g. 9 | 22	Cooperative Children's Book Center workshops	14 | 27	- | 2	- | -	
h. 4 | 4	Other (specify)				

14. Including all activities in Question 12, how many courses or workshops have been available to your staff (but not necessarily attended by them) during the last two years which have dealt specifically with selection and evaluation procedures, issues and/or problems? (Check closest number)

25	9	None	(1)	19	26	3-4	(3)	1	4	7-8	(5)
26	23	1-2	(2)	13	7	5-6	(4)	4	15	Over 8	(6)
								3	5	Don't know	
								9	11	NA	

15. Does your library/IMC have a professional collection for its staff?

a. 91 | 59 Yes (1) 9 | 39 No (2) - | 1 NA

If "Yes", where is it located? (If more than one collection, check the one most used by your library/IMC staff)

b. 84 | 89 In your own building (1)
16 | 9 At system/district headquarters (See "c" below) (2)
(c. How many miles away is this collection? * Miles)
2 Other (specify) 1. not separate from collection (3)
2. visit other library

% of "yes" answers

c. * Actual #'s: 1-5 miles 17 30-70 miles 5 NA 7

Again, if "Yes", how many items does it contain in each of the categories below? (Check closest number in each category)

d. Books		e. Journals		f. Non-print items	
1 | 29	Under 10 (1)	25 | 32	Under 5 (1)	32 | 35	None (1)
27 | 36	10-50 (2)	22 | 24	5-10 (2)	16 | 10	Under 5 (2)
33 | 11	50-150 (3)	20 | 12	10-25 (3)	9 | 4	5-10 (3)
30 | 7	150-500 (4)	14 | 2	25-75 (4)	4 | 1	10-25 (4)
6 | 4	Over 500 (5)	1 | -	Over 75 (5)	10 | 2	Over 25 (5)
2 | 12	NA	18 | 29	NA	29 | 47	NA

16. Does your library/IMC have a computerized cataloging service? (For example, OCLC)

4 | 6 Yes (1) 96 | 88 No (2) In system - | 2 Planning on it - | 1 NA - | 2

-----*Questionnaire continues on back of this page.....*

17. Does your library/IMC have a computerized bibliographic information retrieval search service? (Not OCLC)

a. 5 | 1 Yes (1) 95 | 98 No (2) - | 1 NA

If "Yes", what data base do you use? (Check any which apply)

b. 5 | 1 ERIC (1) ___ Psychological Abstracts (3)
___ AIM/ARM (2) ___ Other (specify)_____ (4)

If "Yes", what information retrieval system do you use? (Check any which apply)

c. ___ Lockheed DIALOG (1) ___ WISE (3)
___ BRS (2) 1 | 1 Other (specify) 1. DCC (4)
4 | - NA 2. Wisc. Dissemination Project

18. Does your library/IMC have a written selection policy? 85 | 57 Yes (1) 15 | 34 No (2)
-| 9 NA

19. In your library/IMC, what is the usual contribution of each of the following persons to the selection procedure for books: (Check ONE "role" for each)

Job Title	Selector		Advisor		No Regular Role		NA	
a. Library Board/Board of Education	0	4 (1)	12	25 (2)	81	58 (3)	7	13
b. Library Director/Sup't. of Schools	5	51	21	10	65	17	9	22
c. Ass't. Library Director/Principal	3	17	47	10	44	24	7	49
d. System Consultant/District Coordinator	5	1	24	16	44	38	27	44
e. Division Head/Department Head	21	24	30	5	23	29	26	42
f. Librarian/Media Specialist	100	50	-	5	-	17	-	28
g. AV Specialist	44	10	13	4	20	32	22	54
h. Paraprofessionals	12	10	26	21	45	35	17	34
i. Faculty	42	-	56	4	1	38	1	57
j. Citizens/Parents	6	2	30	38	52	35	11	25
k. Students	22	1	55	29	21	37	1	34

20. In your library/IMC, what is the usual contribution of each of the following persons to the selection procedure for non-print materials: (Check ONE "role" for each)

Job Title	Selector		Advisor		No Regular Role		NA	
a. Library Board/Board of Education	-	5 (1)	10	21 (3)	81	50 (3)	9	24
b. Library Director/Sup't. of Schools	2	48	20	10	67	15	11	27
c. Ass't. Library Director/Principal	6	12	42	11	42	22	9	55
d. System Consultant/District Coordinator	5	2	30	13	42	33	24	52
e. Division Head/Department Head	17	19	27	7	27	25	28	49
f. Librarian/Media Specialist	87	45	9	7	2	15	2	32
g. AV Specialist	50	10	18	6	13	27	19	57
h. Paraprofessionals	9	8	22	21	52	29	16	42
i. Faculty	52	1	44	4	3	32	1	62
j. Citizens/Parents	3	2	22	32	63	30	11	36
k. Students	13	1	44	22	39	31	4	46

21. In your library/IMC, what resources are used for selection and evaluation of books for children and young adults?

SEE NEXT PAGE (p. 89) FOR FIGURES.

Resource	Estimate percentage of books purchased using this resource:	Circle your level of satisfaction with this resource on scale of 1 to 5: (1=poor; 5=excellent)	
a. Reviews in professional journals	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	k.
b. Reviews in popular periodicals and newspapers	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	m.
c. Publishers' catalogs	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	n.
d. Sales representatives	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	o.
e. Convention/conference displays	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	p.
f. Recommended book lists	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	q.
g. Personal recommendations	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	r.
*h. Examination of books	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	s.
i. Other (specify)_____	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	t.

(If methods overlap, figure may total over 100%)

*If books are examined before purchase, please indicate at what facility this is done_____ j.

22. In your library/IMC, what resources are used for selection and evaluation of non-print materials for children and young adults?

SEE PAGE 90 FOR FIGURES.

Resource	Estimate percentage of non-print purchased using this:	Circle your level of satisfaction with this resource on scale of 1 to 5 (1=poor; 5=excellent)	
a. Reviews in professional journals	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	k.
b. Reviews in popular periodicals and newspapers	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	m.
c. Publishers' catalogs	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	n.
d. Sales representatives	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	o.
e. Convention/conference displays	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	p.
f. Recommended materials lists	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	q.
g. Personal recommendations	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	r.
*h. Previews of materials	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	s.
i. Other (specify)_____	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	t.

(If methods overlap, figure may total over 100%)

*If materials are previewed before purchase, please indicate at what facility this is done:_____ j.

-------*Questionnaire continues on back of this page*.....

Q. 21 Selection of books for children & young adults (school media centers & public libraries)

	Resources	Percentage of Use										Level of Satisfaction 1=poor; 5=excellent					
		1/10	11/20	21/30	31/40	41/50	51/60	61/70	71/80	81/90	91/100	1	2	3	4	5	= 100% of users
a.	Reviews in professional journals	19/4	9/7	7/16	8/4	10/7	7/6	3/2	13/13	8/7	5/7	-/3	6/3	23/28	39/40	27/31	
b.	Reviews in popular periodicals & newspapers	61/36	3/11	3/5	1/1	2/1	-	-	-/1	-	1/-	1/1	16/13	46/42	27/30	9/14	
c.	Publisher's catalogs	40/31	8/11	9/4	5/1	1/5	1/-	1/1	3/1	1/-	-	6/3	18/25	43/33	27/28	6/11	
d.	Sales representatives	50/30	7/7	2/4	-/2	1/-	-/1	-/1	-/1	-	-	3/5	24/20	40/38	24/23	9/13	
e.	Convention/ Conference displays	54/26	5/2	2/1	-	-/1	-	-	1/-	-	-	4/3	9/20	18/20	30/28	39/28	
f.	Recommended book lists	43/36	25/15	6/7	2/2	3/3	1/1	1/1	3/1	1/-	1/-	1/-	10/7	20/27	37/38	32/27	
g.	Personal recommendations	61/46	12/7	2/1	3/2	1/-	-	-	-/1	1/-	1/-	2/1	2/11	28/37	41/39	27/11	
h.	Examination of books	42/34	11/5	5/6	4/1	1/3	1/-	-/1	1/1	1/-	-/1	1/1	1/6	20/16	24/30	54/47	

Facilities at which books are examined:

	School Media Centers %	Public Libraries %
Larger libraries; other IMC's	24	20
Bookstores	9	12
Commercial displays	21	2
In-house review	15	3
CCBC	7	8
University collections	2	-
Book clubs	-	3
Workshops	-	2

Q. 22 Selection of non-print materials for children & young adults (school media centers & public libraries)

	Resource	Percentage of Use										Level of Satisfaction 1=poor; 5=excellent				
		1/10	11/20	21/30	31/40	41/50	51/60	61/70	71/80	81/90	91/100	1	2	3	4	5
a.	Reviews in professional journals	24/5	10/9	9/5	5/1	5/6	1/1	1/1	2/8	2/1	1/4	-/1	7/2	40/25	31/45	22/25
b.	Reviews in popular magazines	24/10	3/4	1/7	1/-	1/-	-	-	-	-	1/-	4/-	18/-	45/55	32/34	-/10
c.	Producer's catalogs	22/7	5/7	5/7	4/1	11/6	3/-	1/-	3/3	1/1	1/4	7/4	19/17	42/40	29/28	2/11
d.	Sales representatives	35/11	5/1	5/1	3/-	1/1	-	-	-/1	-	-/1	5/-	18/19	43/48	19/29	15/5
e.	Convention/ Conference displays	32/13	2/-	3/1	2/-	1/-	-	-	1/-	-	-/1	2/-	10/9	29/32	33/32	27/27
f.	Recommended materials list	27/17	8/2	5/3	2/1	3/4	1/1	-	-/1	2/-	1/1	-/3	8/5	38/18	42/56	18/12
g.	Personal recommendations	32/14	12/5	5/4	1/1	1/4	1/-	1/-	-/1	2/-	3/1	2/2	2/-	20/40	44/40	31/18
h.	Preview of materials	17/10	11/4	8/4	2/1	7/1	3/1	1/1	2/1	5/1	7/3	3/-	3/-	7/15	13/29	74/56

= 100 of user

Facilities at which materials are examined:

	School Media Centers %	Public Libraries %
In-house preview	50	4
District/Larger libraries	8	7
IMC's	6	1
Stores	-	7
None	-	15

This page is for public library respondents only:

School media center respondents, please skip to page 7.....

23. In your library, what resources are used for selection and evaluation of books for adults?

SEE NEXT PAGE (p. 92) FOR FIGURES.

Resource	Estimate percentage of books purchased using this resource:	Circle your level of satisfaction with this resource on scale of 1 to 5: (1=poor; 5=excellent)	
a. Reviews in professional journals	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	k.
b. Reviews in popular periodicals and newspapers	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	m.
c. Publishers' catalogs	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	m.
d. Sales representatives	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	o.
e. Convention/conference displays	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	p.
f. Recommended book lists	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	q.
g. Personal recommendations	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	r.
*h. Examination of books	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	s.
i. Other (specify).....	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	t.

(If methods overlap, figure may total over 100%)

*If books are examined before purchase, please indicate at what facility this is done_____ j.

24. In your library, what resources are used for selection and evaluation of non-print materials for adults?

SEE PAGE 93 FOR FIGURES.

Resource	Estimate percentage of non-print purchased using this:	Circle your level of satisfaction with this resource on scale of 1 to 5: (1=poor; 5=excellent)	
a. Reviews in professional journals	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	k.
b. Reviews in popular periodicals and newspapers	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	m.
c. Publishers' catalogs	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	n.
d. Sales representatives	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	o.
e. Convention/conference displays	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	p.
f. Recommended materials lists	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	q.
g. Personal recommendations	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	r.
*h. Previews of materials	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	s.
i. Other (specify)_____	_____%	1 2 3 4 5	t.

(If methods overlap, figure may total over 100%)

*If materials previewed before purchase, please indicate at what facility this is done:_____ j.

Q. 23 Selection of books for adults (public libraries only)

	Resource	Percentage of Use										Levels of Satisfaction 1=poor; 5=excellent					
		1/10	11/20	21/30	31/40	41/50	51/60	61/70	71/80	81/90	91/100	1	2	3	4	5	
a.	Reviews in professional journals	5	5	11	4	4	10	4	15	11	4	2	1	20	48	29	=100% of users
b.	Reviews in popular magazines & papers	38	15	7	1	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	13	41	32	14	
c.	Publisher's catalogs	32	7	6	1	3	-	1	1	-	-	7	16	35	31	10	
d.	Sales representatives	28	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	26	37	23	12	
e.	Convention/Conference displays	24	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	29	35	21	
f.	Recommended book lists	40	10	5	2	4	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	19	49	29	
g.	Personal recommendations	50	5	4	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	10	36	40	12	
h.	Examination of books	26	3	2	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	4	18	30	48	

Facilities at which books are examined:

	Public libraries %
Larger libraries	16
Bookstores	14
Workshops	3
Commercial displays	3

Q. 24 Selection of non-print materials for adults (public libraries only)

	Resource	Percentage of Use										Levels of Satisfaction 1=poor; 5=excellent					
		1/10	11/20	21/30	31/40	41/50	51/60	61/70	71/80	81/90	91/100	1	2	3	4	5	=100% of users
a.	Reviews in professional journals	10	7	4	3	5	2	1	5	1	7	2	5	28	43	23	
b.	Reviews in popular magazines & papers	13	5	3	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	3	11	34	40	11	
c.	Producer's catalogs	13	4	4	2	7	-	-	1	-	3	4	11	29	51	4	
d.	Sales representatives	11	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	12	53	35	-	
e.	Convention/Conference displays	13	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	32	27	27	
f.	Recommended materials lists	21	3	2	-	6	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	29	46	23	
g.	Personal recommendations	16	4	4	3	1	1	1	1	-	-	2	2	33	38	24	
h.	Preview of materials	8	4	2	-	2	1	1	1	1	3	-	3	15	38	44	

Facilities at which materials are examined:

	Public libraries %
Larger libraries	10
In-house preview	4
Stores	4
Workshops	2
None	11

All respondents continue here, please:

25. In your library/IMC, how often are materials (book and non-print) ordered? (Check ONE)

19 | 4	annually (1)	18 | 15	quarterly (3)	3 | 12	bi-weekly (5)
18 | 4	semi-annually (2)	30 | 42	monthly (4)	3 | 13	weekly (6)
				3 | 10	NA
				6 | -	as needed

26. Are your materials (Check ANY which apply)

71 | 85	processed by your library/IMC?	(29 | 34%)*	a.
25 | 14	processed by a centralized system?	(18 | 2 %)	b.
43 | 28	purchased pre-processed?	(6 | 1 %)	c.

Those which processed 100% by these methods:

*If more than one method is used, please indicate the percentage of materials applicable to each method.

The breakdown by percentages here is insignificant.

27. Do you and your staff have easy access to a library/IMC collection which is more comprehensive than your own?

a. 71 \| 79 Yes (1) 26 \| 18 No (2) 2 \| 3 NA

a. If "Yes", How far away is this collection in driving time? (Check ONE)

b. 69 \| 42 Under 1/2 hr. (1) 27 \| 39 1/2 to 1 hour (2) 2 \| 11 1 to 2 hours (3) 2 \| 4 Over 2 hours (4) - \| 4 NA

% of "yes" answers

Again, if "Yes", do you or other members of the library/IMC staff use this collection for review and examination before purchase?

c. 48 \| 48 Yes (1) 50 \| 42 No (2) 2 \| 10 NA

If "Yes", in order to use this collection, do you get (Check any which apply)

d. % of "yes" answers		
31 | 8	released time	(1)
17 | 31	inservice time	(2)
8 | 45	paid travel	(3)
69 | 43	none of the above	(4)

If "No," why is this collection not used? (Check any which apply)

e. % of "no" answers		
11 | 18	collection too far away	(1)
43 | 36	no released time to use it	(2)
20 | 24	no paid travel available	(3)
24 | 20	collection not relevant to my collection	(4)
11 | 7	collection doesn't get new materials quickly enough	(5)
15 | 29	other (specify)	(6)

Actual #'s: 3-not needed
4-not worth the time it takes
9-borrow, use delivery or mail
3-never thought of it
]-manual explains
1-viewed as intruder

For school media center respondents only

Public library respondents please skip to Number 31.....

28. Are the textbooks which are used in your school selected by: (Check any which appl

%				
3	Superintendent of schools	(1)	3 Librarian/Media Specialist	(5)
20	Principal	(2)	1 AV Specialist	(6)
7	Board of Education	(3)	9 Department Heads/Consultants	(7)
50	Teachers	(4)		
48	Committee (specify by job title:) Not broken down			(8)
2	Other (specify) specialists-2; parents-1,			(9)

---------Questionnaire continues on back of this page.....

School media respondents continue here.....

29. Are textbooks reviewed before adoption? 100 Yes (1) -- No (2)

b. If "Yes", does your school receive review copies? 91 Yes (1) 6 No (2)
2 Sometimes 1 NA

c. If "No", where does your school review textbook samples?

Actual #'s:
6 School district preview collection (1)
1 University/college collection (2)
1 Other (specify) sales representative (3)
1 NA

30. For classroom use, do individual teachers in your school purchase with individual teacher funds, select for purchase with department or general school funds or recommend for purchase subject to review of supervisor. (Check ONE action for each category of material)

	Purchase	Select for Purchase	Recommend for Purchase	NA
a. Textbooks	5 (1)	38 (2)	52 (3)	5
b. Trade books	4	20	61	15
c. Instructional materials other than trade books	5	38	50	6
d. Audiovisual software	2	28	64	6
e. Audiovisual hardware	1	15	70	13
f. Other (specify)_____				

31. Name of Respondent (Optional)_____

Position_____

Library or School_____ Date_____

Address_____ Zip_____

Please return this questionnaire to:

Donna Barkman
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Teacher Education Building
School of Education IMC
225 North Mills Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Congratulations, you are through!!!

Thank you very much!!!

PROCEDURES

Interviews

After informal questionnaires were prepared (one form for potential user-institutions and one for collections and resources), interviews were conducted in state and out-of-state. Persons were chosen who represented the spectrum of possible library/media/education interests:

Public libraries: all system headquarters' libraries plus four libraries not in systems.

Public library systems: representatives of eleven systems.

CESAs: four chosen by the Wisconsin Dissemination Project, plus visits to two Special Education Instructional Materials Centers.

School Districts: eleven, from various areas of the State.

University of Wisconsin units: ten library/media departments plus visits to their IMCs or EMCs.

Technical colleges: four, from South, North, East and West.

Intertype councils: representatives of all four councils.

Professional associations: selected officers of Wisconsin Library Association, Wisconsin School Library Media Association, Wisconsin Audiovisual Association, Wisconsin Education Association, etc.

State consultants: seven representatives of the Division for Library Services.

Publishers/Producers: representatives of their organizations (AAP, AMP) plus persons from individual companies.

Examination centers: Washington, D.C., Pennsylvania; representatives from Maryland, Connecticut, and many other states (see History section, p. 10).

Consultants: representatives from Library of Congress and the United States Office of Education.

For a complete list of interviewees, see Appendix A, Part 2.

Survey

The survey form was constructed for the purpose of determining the selection and evaluation systems and styles used in both school media centers and public libraries.

The questionnaire was composed with the help of experienced persons in the library/media, education, and survey research sectors, and was revised until a seventh draft was considered sound enough for testing. The survey form was then completed by three public librarians and three school media specialists; based on their comments, further revision resulted in the questionnaire's final form.

The Wisconsin Survey Research Lab advised on methods of sampling. Two hundred school media centers and two hundred public libraries were chosen by systematic selection, based on Division for Library Services alphabetical (by town) lists.

The questionnaires were mailed on April 10, 1978, with a cover letter requesting return by April 21, 1978. Over-all, there was a 72% return. The questionnaire was tabulated manually. Exact results can be found in Appendix B.

Advisory Committee

Henry E. Bates, Jr.
City Librarian
Milwaukee Public Library

David Bunnow
Media Specialist
West Senior High School
Green Bay

Ann Becker
Professor, Department of
Curriculum & Instruction
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Mary Cronin
Coordinator, Library Council of
Metropolitan Milwaukee

Rose Holmes
Supervisor, Cataloging & Processing
Madison Metropolitan School District

Avis Jobrack
Children's Librarian
Oshkosh

Rosanne Krubsack
Cooperative Educational Service
Agency
Fennimore

Neah Lohr
Supervisor of Library Services
Instructional Materials Center
Reedsburg

Kenneth McMahon
Instructional Media Specialist
Bureau for Exceptional Children
Department of Public Instruction

Sandra Robbers
Young Adult Services Librarian
Southwest Wisconsin Library System
Fennimore

Don L. Tolliver
Director of Libraries
University of Wisconsin-
Whitewater

A twelve-person Advisory Committee was selected by representatives of the Division for Library Services in conjunction with Denise B. Erwin, Project Administrator. The committee was chosen to represent all kinds of libraries, media centers and educational communities.

In mid-October, 1977, these persons were invited to serve on the committee; all accepted the invitation. On November 26th, the Project Coordinator wrote the Advisory Committee, specifying a timetable for the project and enclosing a copy of Cora Paul Bomar's Guide to the Development of Educational Media Selection Centers.

On January 3, 1978, an Interim Report was submitted to the Division for Library Services and to the members of the Advisory Committee. This report detailed the progress of the study, projected the steps to be undertaken next and asked for comments and questions from the committee members.

During the December-January period of in-state interviews, four of the committee members were contacted separately because they, in their positions, represented particular components of the library/media/education communities.

Early in March, a meeting of the entire committee was scheduled. It was held on April 4th and was attended by nine members plus one substitute representative. A slide-tape of the examination center in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, was shown. Sample interview forms and a financial report were distributed. The following subjects were discussed: terminology of the examination center concept, definitions, comparison with regional media centers, optimum number of centers, center attendance (travel time and released time), mobile services, the "pilot" idea, need for concrete descriptive detail of centers, funding possibilities and local fee assessment. At adjournment, members were encouraged to communicate ideas, information and opinions by mail or phone at any time. The next and final meeting was scheduled for May 23rd.

On May 19th, the first half of the report draft was sent to each committee member. At the beginning of the meeting on May 23rd, the second half of the draft was distributed. This meeting was attended by nine committee members. A tenth member communicated response and opinions by telephone. An eleventh member submitted a resignation by mail, stating that she felt that the committee did not have a clearly defined purpose.

After reading the completed report draft, committee members asked questions and made comments. Some members offered confirmation of the need for centers. Suggestions were made concerning clarification and points of emphasis. Each of these suggestions was incorporated into the final report.

While no formal concensus was solicited, the final expressions of the committee concerning the report were those of support and concurrence.

COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL MEDIA SELECTION CENTERS
INTERVIEW FORM: CONSULTANTS AND POTENTIAL USERS

NAME:_____ POSITION:_____

INSITUTTION:_____ ADDRESS:_____

PHONE:_____ DATE:_____

1. What selection resources are used currently by your institution (or consultant constituency)?

   Print? Non-Print?

   Are there gaps in coverage? Are there redundancies?

   What evaluation criteria are used?

   How do you (or practitioners) keep up with burgeoning materials/ issues/ concepts/ applications?

   Do present resources provide continuing education in selection/evaluation/ use and application?

   Do you do this kind of continuing education independently of selection/ evaluation tools and resources? How?

2. What needs might a selection center meet for your institution (or consultant constituency)?

   Introduction to broader range of materials?

   Hands-on selection and evaluation opportunity?

   Evaluation services: consultants, annotations, bibliographies, field testing...

   Continuing education programs/services/resources.

   Centralized cataloging, processing?

   Interlibrary loan? Union catalog?

   Access to high cost/low use materials?

   Development of new retrieval system?

   Clearinghouse for information about library/media/education materials, developments, issues?

3. What do you see as the relationship between an educational media selection center and other operating resource centers (CESAs, University collections, CCBC, Central Wisconsin Center, etc.)?

4. What is the significance of distance from user institutions to the selection centers?

   How far might you (or other selecting persons) travel?

   How frequently might the selection center be used?

   Might such travel be subsidized by the user institution? (In-service; released time, etc.)

5. Might your institution be able to cooperate in funding such a selection center? If yes, in what way and to what extent?

   Can you contribute any ideas for sources of funding?

6. What is your over-all opinion of the selection center idea?

   Are they needed?

   Are they feasible?

   Who would the users be?

   Advantages and disadvantages:

7. Interview and Data Suggestions: Persons, Resource Centers, Institutions and Organizations which might be interviewed/reviewed.

COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL MEDIA SELECTION CENTERS

INTERVIEW FORM: OTHER RESOURCE/SELECTION CENTERS

NAME:_____ POSITION:_____

INSTITUTION:_____ ADDRESS:_____

PHONE:_____ DATE:_____

1. What kinds of media does your center contain?

   Format?

   Age levels?

   Special Education?

   Scope: educational, enrichment, recreational; any limitations on selection?

2. What is the purpose of your center in terms of function? To provide opportunity to familiarize, to select, to evaluate materials? To use materials? To test them? (Why are the materials <u>there</u>?)

3. In addition to the materials, does your center offer programs/ services/ continuing education?

   What?

4. How are your materials chosen?

   Are user groups included in the selection and evaluation process?

5. Who are your users?

   How do they use your center?

   Who might your <u>potential</u> users be?

6. Who sponsors your center? Funds it; staffs it, supports in other ways (publishers, volunteers, etc.)?

   What is your annual budget? For materials?
   For services?
   For staff?

7. What might the cooperation possibilities be between your institution and a selection center?
   Sharing resources/materials? Centralized technical services?
   Sharing space? Personnel? Coordinator?

8. Can you contribute any ideas for funding sources for selection centers?

9. What is your over-all opinion of the selection center idea?